

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Muscle Shoals measure has been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and I want to ask the Chair if it now automatically comes before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It comes before the Senate; and if an adjournment or recess is had, then it comes up at 2 o'clock on the next day when the Senate shall be in session.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if it is the purpose of the Senator from Oregon to move an adjournment, may I ask that the Chair lay the Muscle Shoals joint resolution before the Senate at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is unnecessary until 2 o'clock, unless the Senator wants to discuss it, because, under the rule, it is not required.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock on Friday next.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, before that motion is put, let me ask the Chair if the Muscle Shoals measure will be before the Senate when we meet again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If an adjournment is had at this time, the Muscle Shoals joint resolution will come before the Senate at 2 o'clock on the day when the Senate shall meet.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum. Before the motion of the Senator from Oregon is put, I think we ought to have a quorum here to pass on the question.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DILL. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	Keyes	Shortridge
Barkley	Glenn	La Follette	Simmons
Bingham	Goff	McCulloch	Smith
Black	Goldsborough	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Gould	McMaster	Steck
Blease	Greene	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Grundy	Moses	Stephens
Bratton	Hale	Norbeck	Sullivan
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Hatfield	Oddie	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Hawes	Overman	Trammell
Copeland	Hayden	Phipps	Tydings
Couzens	Hebert	Pine	Vandenberg
Dale	Hefflin	Ransdell	Wagner
Dill	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Walcott
Fess	Johnson	Robison, Ky.	Walsh, Mass.
Frazier	Jones	Schall	Waterman
George	Kean	Sheppard	Watson
Gillett	Kendrick	Shipstead	

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. Brock] is unavoidably detained on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I understand that in my absence the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] made a motion that the Senate adjourn until next Friday. Am I right?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He withheld that motion.

Mr. WATSON. I insist on the motion.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, before that is done—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana withhold his motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. Will the Senator withhold it?

Mr. WATSON. I shall be glad to withhold it for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator whether or not it is intended to have a session on next Friday?

Mr. WATSON. When we meet on Friday it is my intention, as soon as the Vice President calls the Senate to order, to move to adjourn until the following Tuesday, and then, on the following Tuesday, to take up the Muscle Shoals measure.

Mr. DILL. I understand, then, that we are going to loaf for a week? We are not going to do anything?

Mr. WATSON. We are going to loaf—l-o-a-f.

Mr. DILL. The Senator realizes that every week of loafing we take now means two or three weeks of work next summer.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think so. I will say to my friend that I think we shall really save time.

I renew the motion, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana moves that the Senate adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, March 28, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, March 25, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Heavenly Father, while our conduct is often unwise and our lives seem to be commonplace, yet in moments of encouragement we think of ourselves as children of the Most High, who dost bestow upon us the blessing of each day. In Thy sight no life is common or worthless; so bless us with the inspiration of hope and with a sense of dignity, that we may be real and abiding contributions to the moral and patriotic forces of our land. We praise Thee these days for Him whose divine passion finds its consummation in love, sorrow, and sacrifice. With fidelity to Thee and loyalty to our country, help us to do to-day's work, and thus we shall have a fine conception of a life which is loving, brave, and tender. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Greece on the 25th of March, 1830, declared her independence. It is my purpose at this hour to give expression of congratulations to Greece that she has enjoyed 100 years of self-government. I shall not recall the battles, the sufferings, the wanton cruelties and massacres, but the glory of Greece under her independence.

Scholars who study history of the ages learn that Greece was the ancient center of luxury and culture that dates from the earliest era of civilization. The heroic deeds and valor of the Hellenic soldiers were marked with patriotism and intrepid courage at the Battles of Marathon and Thermopylae; a century and a half later Alexander the Great, the conqueror of Asia, returned to Athens a victorious hero, and placing his sword upon the altar of fame wept because he had no other worlds to conquer. Greece for many years held supremacy on land and sea and was devoted to the public weal. Her people naturally became engrossed with mental development, culture, and refinement, at the expense of physical endurance and time-honored war record of their past. The invading nations with barbaric strength and cruelty were victorious in their campaigns, and thus Greece in 1470 was forced under the Ottoman power. The Turks ruled, with the exception of a few years of Venetian control, until the London protocol of February 3, 1830. This subjugation carries out the philosophy of Petri, the greatest living archaeologist, who attempts to prove a nation's power lasts but a few hundred years, when it passes into the age of wealth and thereby its people become slaves to ease and pleasure. Then after centuries of mental decay the nation starts anew with a physical strength augmented by strife to again pass through the periods of sculpture, painting, literature, music, and the sciences, and like the phoenix rises from its ashes young and beautiful.

In the year 1814 a society of young Greeks was formed for the purpose of creating a spirit of revolution to throw off the Turkish yoke. This club was successful in raising a regiment that had several skirmishes in the interest of independence. After eight years of revolution the strife for independence made such substantial progress that it created a deep sympathy in the United States. Committees were formed and funds collected for the relief of the victims of the war. President Monroe in his message to Congress on the 8th of December, 1823, brought the revolution to the attention of the American people, which animated the following resolution, offered in the House by Mr. Webster on January 19, 1824:

Resolved, That provisions ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an agent or commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such an appointment.

Mr. Webster spoke in favor of the resolution, from which, in part, I quote:

What I propose, and what I shall say, has reference to modern not to ancient Greece, to the living, not to the dead. * * *

There the oppressed are perhaps no better than the oppressors, but in case of Greece there are millions of Christian men, not without knowledge, not without refinement, not without strong thirst for all the pleasures of civilized life, trampled into the very earth century after century by a barbarous, pillaging, relentless soldiery.

Mr. Poinsett, of South Carolina, opposed the resolution on the ground that the commissioners might fall into the hands of the Turks, an event, he said—

By no means impossible, in the present state of Greece—what would be their fate? The Porte has not been remarkable for its strict observance of the laws of nations, in its intercourse with the powers of Europe, and it is not probable that such a court would be very scrupulous in its conduct toward a nation whose flag it has never acknowledged. Or let us imagine, what is much more probable, that on the rumor of our having taken any measure in favor of Greece, the barbarous and infuriated Janissaries at Smyrna were to assassinate our consul and fellow citizens residing there; might not a war grow out of such acts?

Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, also opposed the resolution, substantiating the views of Mr. Poinsett, to which Mr. Clay made the following reply:

If, in a proposition so simple, so plain, so harmless, so free from all real danger as this, we were to shut our hearts from the influence of every generous, every manly feeling, let gentlemen say so at once. But he could tell the gentleman from Virginia that he who follows the dictates of a heart warmed with humanity and with the love of freedom has a better guide than that cold, unfeeling, pence-calculating policy which shrinks before it is menaced and will never do a noble deed for fear of some remote, possible consequence of conceivable danger.

Mr. Webster spoke several times upon the resolution. In his last speech he said:

They look to us as the great Republic of the earth; and they ask us, by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy. I can not say, sir, that they will succeed; that rests with Heaven. But for myself, sir, if I should to-morrow hear that they have failed; that their last phalanx had sunk beneath the Turkish scimitar; that the flames of their last city had sunk in its ashes; and that naught remained but the wide melancholy waste where Greece once was, I should still reflect, with the most heartfelt satisfaction, that I have asked you, in the name of 7,000,000 of freemen, that you would give them at least the cheering of one friendly voice.

Greece in the transition period has made great progress since her independence in 1830. Then the population of Athens was 14,000—now 1,000,000; then Piræus, the port of Athens, had but one building, the customhouse, seldom more than two or three sailing vessels in the harbor at one time; now the population is nearly 200,000, and as a shipping center exceeds that of Marseille. Then the trade with the United States was only nominal; now it surpasses the total of all the Balkan states. A national bank was established in 1841, which gave Athens her first international financial credit. No nation develops under the yoke of another, as Greece so well exemplified during the 100 years of her independence.

We should not forget the obligation the world owes to Greece, when she cared for one million and a half of Greek and Armenian refugees. She fed them; they were taken into the homes of the citizens and treated as members of the families. Greek women formed themselves into societies and taught the refugees the art of embroidering; rented shops where the results of their labors might be exhibited and sold. The humanity of Greece will ever remain as evidence of her Christian spirit. Greece is fast developing many industries, improving her municipalities toward a more perfect plan to meet modern civilization. There are 225,768 Greeks in the United States, one-half of whom are members of the Orthodox Church. Many have been naturalized and take their places in the industries and American institutions, in the arts and academies of learning, where they have proven to be diligent and patriotic American citizens. The Grecian motto is true to their faith, "Iper, pisteos kalpatridos." [Applause.]

LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALDRICH). Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in supplementing my remarks in the House on February 28, 1930, in behalf of the adoption of House Resolution 69, I wish to call to your attention the fact that Mr. Louis R. Glavis, mentioned therein, who Hon. Joseph D. Beck stated is a partner of Mr. Richard H. Lee, the lobbyist, received from the Federal Treasury a salary of \$625 a month and expenses for services as an investigator from April 23, 1928, to June 30, 1929. The complete disbursements for salary and expenses, which amount to many thousands of dollars, can be found in the report of the Secretary of the Senate from July 1, 1927, to June 30, 1928, pages 186, 259, and 265, and the report of the Secretary of the Senate from July 1, 1928, to June 30,

1929, pages 75, 89, 97, 103, 107, 111, 112, 118, 128, 137, 145, 151, 155, 157, 161, and 164.

The testimony of Hon. Joseph D. Beck, the gubernatorial candidate, who was supported by the La Follette Progressive Republican Club of Milwaukee County with the Lee money, indicates the interest of Mr. Glavis, including a speech delivered by him in the Wisconsin 1928 primary campaign, even during the period of time that said Glavis was on the Federal pay roll as heretofore mentioned.

If you will particularly note Mr. Glavis's expense items, as detailed in the pages of the Senate reports which I have heretofore mentioned, you will find that the Federal Government paid many hundreds of dollars for many trips of Mr. Glavis from Washington to New York City.

It appears necessary, therefore, in the public interest that one of the first witnesses to be subpoenaed in the investigation as proposed by House Resolution 69 should be Mr. Glavis, as in addition to obtaining full facts on his connections with the lobbyist, Mr. Lee, who contributed many thousands of dollars to the La Follette Progressive Republican Club of Milwaukee County, which club received and expended such funds in violation of the Wisconsin corrupt practices acts, it would be highly essential to determine what Indians and Indian affairs Mr. Glavis investigated in the city of New York during his many trips to that city as an investigator on Government salary and at Government expense. In all probability we will find that a great portion, if not all, of the contacts on Indian affairs during these trips to New York City were contacts with Indians of the type of the lobbyist, Mr. Richard H. Lee, of New York, who Hon. Joseph D. Beck stated was a partner of Mr. Glavis. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress have received Bulletin No. 41, dated March 12, 1930, issued by the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau. Page 2 of this tariff propaganda contains an article by D. J. Lewis, a paid servant of this disreputable lobby, indicating that I had misrepresented facts in the address which I delivered in the House on February 28, 1930. In the brief time which I have to-day it will not be possible for me to present to the House irrefutable proof indicating that I misstated no facts, but that Mr. Lewis's statement just referred to is a most magnificent specimen of willful, careless, reckless mishandling of the truth.

At a later date, if the House will kindly grant me about one hour's time, I shall answer the untruths of this hired man of the Rawleigh tariff lobby and incorporate in the RECORD citations and extracts of testimony before the Congress of the United States, including testimony of Mr. Rawleigh unequivocally asking for the reduction or repeal of tariff on many of the products which he uses, as well as the mailing list of products of the Rawleigh Co., together with specific references showing that most of such Rawleigh products are protected by a very high tariff, the untruthful statements of Mr. D. J. Lewis to the contrary notwithstanding. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the voices of many of the candidates supported in the 1928 Wisconsin primary campaign by the La Follette Progressive Republican Club of Milwaukee County and other satellites of their political combination have been raised in violent denunciation and vituperation in criticism of the appointment of Hon. Charles Evans Hughes to the position of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. These villifiers from my fair State have waxed eloquent in picturing themselves as knighted champions of the people's interests and protectors of the fountainhead of justice, the Supreme Court, from corrupting corporate and blighting influences of combinations and monopolies. They claim to exemplify the highest ideals of Supreme Court integrity and strut forth as crusaders to effectuate those ideals. Why, Mr. Speaker, those in Wisconsin who have condemned the appointment of Hon. Charles Evans Hughes to the Supreme Court of the United States, who have denounced and villified this honorable, illustrious, incorruptible, and efficient citizens are to-day in Wisconsin supporting Mr. John W. Reynolds, the present attorney general of Wisconsin, who is a candidate for the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Mr. Reynolds has for many weeks been covering the State in behalf of his candidacy.

This is the same Mr. John W. Reynolds who was supported for the position of attorney general by the La Follette Progressive Republican Club of Milwaukee County, in the 1928 Wisconsin primary campaign, and in whose behalf said club received from the master lobbyist, Mr. Richard H. Lee, of New York, thousands of dollars in violation of the Wisconsin corrupt practices acts, which they expended in the chain system of campaigning in behalf of candidates of their faction, including Mr. Reynolds. Why, Mr. Speaker, those political henchmen of Mr. John W. Reynolds, who so bitterly denounced the appointment of Chief Justice Hughes should be the first to have demanded

that the attorney general devote the people's time, which he is now spending in his campaign throughout the State for a position on the Wisconsin Supreme Court bench, to performing the duties of the office which he now holds, and endeavor to clear up the Lee contribution, particularly in view of the fact that his primary campaign of 1928 benefited by the violations of the Wisconsin corrupt practices acts, with the Lee money. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that if the good people of Wisconsin had an opportunity to have presented to them all of the sordid facts in the Lee case that they would become so aroused as to flood the ballot boxes in the forthcoming judiciary election with an avalanche of ballots against Mr. Reynolds. [Applause.]

As the late Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, often said—

Give the people light and they will find their way.

[Applause.]

CONFERENCE REPORT ON BILL H. R. 5616

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 5616) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa presents a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5616) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Section 6 of such act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, is further amended so that the limitation of payments which the Secretary of Agriculture may make is increased to \$25,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span: *Provided*, That the Federal participation shall be limited to \$15,000 per mile until the original certified 7 per cent system of such State shall have been surfaced: *Provided further*, That any such increase above \$15,000 per mile shall be certified by the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Secretary of Agriculture as securing actual extension of the highway system or economy in its construction: *Provided further*, That the limitation of payments herein provided shall apply to the public-land States, except that the same is hereby increased in proportion to the increased percentage of Federal aid authorized by section 11 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes,' approved November 9, 1921, as amended. The provisions of this section relating to the limitation of payments per mile which the Secretary of Agriculture may make shall apply to all funds heretofore appropriated and available for payment to the States on the date of approval of this amendatory act and to all sums hereafter appropriated for carrying out the provisions of such act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented."

And the Senate agree to the same.

C. C. DOWELL,
CHAS. BRAND,
ED B. ALMON,

Managers on the part of the House.

L. C. PHIPPS,
GEO. H. MOSES,
KENNETH McKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5616) to amend the act entitled

"An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees:

On amendment No. 1: The Senate amendment added to the bill a new section which amended section 6 of the act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, by increasing the limit of payments which the Secretary of Agriculture might make under such section to \$25,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span, and provided that the limitation of payment in public-land States might be increased in proportion to the increased percentage authorized by section 11 of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921, as amended. The amendment applied to funds appropriated and available for payment to the States on the date of the approval of the amendatory act, as well as to future appropriations made. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment No. 1 of the Senate, with an amendment which provides that such limit of payments shall be \$15,000 per mile until the original certified 7 per cent system of such State shall have been surfaced, and further provides that any increase above the \$15,000 limit shall be certified by the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Secretary of Agriculture as securing actual extension of the highway system or economy in its construction.

On amendment No. 2: The Senate amendment makes a change in section number, and the House recedes.

C. C. DOWELL,
CHAS. BRAND,
ED B. ALMON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, there is just one amendment, and the members of the committee have agreed, and I ask unanimous consent that the conference report may be considered at this time.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the gentleman will explain in detail to the House the agreement that has been reached in reference to the item of a larger allotment to States for post roads?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement accompanying the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like the chairman of the Committee on Roads to explain exactly what amendment No. 1 does to the condition which he knows exists in Massachusetts and other States.

Mr. DOWELL. The amendment as now agreed upon provides for \$25,000 per mile provided the Federal participation shall be limited to \$15,000 per mile until the original certified 7 per cent has been surfaced under certain conditions.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does that mean 7 per cent of the entire country or 7 per cent of any one State?

Mr. DOWELL. Seven per cent of any one State.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman be kind enough to define a little further what he means by 7 per cent of the original surfacing?

Mr. DOWELL. The law originally provided that the States should certify to the Bureau of Public Roads 7 per cent of the roads within the States. That was done some years ago and all of the Federal participation has been placed on that 7 per cent. This agreement provides that when the 7 per cent has been surfaced, then, by the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture, it may be increased to \$25,000 per mile.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the 7 per cent mean all highways primary and secondary within the bounds of a State?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. How many States have been able to comply with the 7 per cent?

Mr. DOWELL. There are only a few of them that have been completed.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have not the record with me as to Massachusetts.

Mr. DOWELL. I have not examined that, but it was claimed by those in Massachusetts that it had practically completed the 7 per cent.

Mr. TREADWAY. So that if Massachusetts has completed its 7 per cent—and I take it from what the chairman says he thinks it has.

Mr. DOWELL. No; I do not think it has, and I am not willing to state that. I say it was claimed here by those at the time the bill was originally passed that it was at least approaching that amount.

Mr. TREADWAY. Assuming we have reached the 7 per cent in Massachusetts, then under your amendment will there be \$25,000 per mile available?

Mr. DOWELL. With the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is within the discretion of the Secretary under certain conditions.

Mr. TREADWAY. I suppose, theoretically, and even practically, all of these appropriations must have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture under any circumstances?

Mr. DOWELL. Every project must have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not understand just what explanation was made with reference to public-land States.

Mr. DOWELL. It gives the same percentage of increase to the public-land States that they have in the original bill.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman realizes I am very much interested, and I dislike to take up the time of the committee, but I do not understand what the 7 per cent is. Seven per cent of what?

Mr. DOWELL. Of the roads within a State; public roads within a State. I am talking about the Federal-aid system, which includes 7 per cent of all of the roads within any State, and that has been certified by the highway commission to the Bureau of Roads.

Mr. BEEDY. That is, if the State of Maine has completed 7 per cent under Federal aid of all the total mileage within the State, then the State can get in excess of \$15,000 per mile for highway construction if the Secretary of Agriculture approves it, but not otherwise.

Mr. DOWELL. That is true.

Mr. BEEDY. Then, under the effect of the amendment, is not the State of Rhode Island the only State that is affected?

Mr. DOWELL. No.

Mr. BEEDY. What other State is affected?

Mr. DOWELL. I do not recall; but I think a number of States are affected.

Mr. BEEDY. That is quite important, if there are a number of them.

Mr. DOWELL. There are several very close to the line and a number that have passed it, so I was informed.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND] what is the condition of Ohio with reference to the 7 per cent system?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. The 7 per cent system is almost completed.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman to say that he did not wish to authoritatively say that Massachusetts had completed its 7 per cent.

Mr. DOWELL. I would not say that about any State without having looked it up.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have been reliably informed since the last colloquy with the gentleman that several States have completed the 7 per cent limit, and I am told North Carolina, Ohio, and Massachusetts are at least three of that number.

Therefore, if I thoroughly understand the amendment—and the gentleman has made it, I think, quite clear—so far as the interests of Massachusetts are concerned, I think we are securing in this amendment what the State officials asked its Members here to particularly endeavor to obtain from the committee, namely, a \$25,000-per-mile contribution. As I understand the explanation of the chairman of the committee, if I may speak in behalf of Massachusetts and my colleagues, I think our interests are safeguarded under the amendment the gentleman offers.

Mr. GARNER. As long as Massachusetts is satisfied, it looks to me as though we should let the conference report go through.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I am reliably informed through the Bureau of Public Roads that the States which have completed the necessary 7 per cent construction in order to secure the allotment of \$25,000 per mile are Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maryland, Delaware, Massachusetts, and New York.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11045. An act to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of a site for the new House Office Building; and

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution making an appropriation to complete the restoration of the frigate *Constitution*.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 23, 46, and 47 to the bill (H. R. 9979) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1930, and June 30, 1931, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2667. An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. GREENE and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the War Department.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8705. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River at or near Prophetstown, Ill.;

H. R. 8706. An act to legalize a bridge across the Pecatonica River at Freeport, Ill.;

H. R. 8970. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River on Ashland Avenue near One hundred and thirty-fourth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 8971. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to widen, maintain, and operate the existing bridge across the Little Calumet River on Halsted Street near One hundred and forty-fifth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 8972. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River on Ashland Avenue near One hundred and fortieth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 9979. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1930, and June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11045. An act to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of a site for the new House Office Building; and

H. J. Res. 264. A joint resolution making an appropriation to complete the restoration of the frigate *Constitution*.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3371. An act to amend section 88 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10813) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10813, with Mr. LaGUARDIA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, on yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] closed a thoughtful and otherwise notable speech on the tariff question by declaring that there is a question before America and the Congress more important than even the tariff or prohibition questions. He referred to the fact that American barns and cotton yards, grain elevators, and other places of storage are full of farm products and the warehouses full of the output of industry, which can not be profitably sold, while great numbers of American working people are out of employment, many of them hungry. The gentleman did not have time to state fully what he had in mind, but what he said showed clearly that he is concerned about the present conditions of distress among farmers and industrial workers. I think the question why, under these conditions, America should be receiving more hands to be idle and more stomachs to become hungry must have been in the gentleman's mind, as at least an important part of the paramount problem he was pondering. That question was in my mind when I obtained the promise of this time and when I prepared what I shall try to say to you on the subject of imported alien Mexican labor and the farm problem. If I can obtain the time and the House will hear me, I shall try to discuss other phases of this problem from time to time hereafter.

I have lived in Texas, a Mexican border State, throughout my entire life. Indeed, my forefathers were there while Texas was yet a part of Mexico. My acquaintance with Mexican people of all classes, from the privileged, dominating few, to the mass of oppressed and wretched peons whom the upper classes treat as degraded inferiors, has afforded me considerable opportunity to observe them and the economic, social, and political results which their character produces in Mexico and wherever large numbers of them assemble. In the active practice of my profession as a lawyer I have visited many of the counties of the Rio Grande border, from El Paso to the lower valley, and the cities of San Antonio, Austin, and Houston, farther east and north, where I saw Mexican border conditions and the tendencies of Mexican peon population.

Having taken some active part in the public affairs of my State, I have for many years noted the effect of the lower stratum of Mexican life upon the political and social problems of that region.

During more than 10 years' service as a Member of the House of Representatives and of its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I have given study to the problems of Mexican immigration, following my former observations by special studies. During the latter half of the year 1929, while my colleague on the committee, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, and I were making a survey of this problem on which we have reported to our committee, I visited 40 to 50 of the counties of Texas and all the larger cities in which this population is greatest and can be studied to best advantage. I extended my travels entirely across the State of Oklahoma, through the middle and western parts of Kansas, nearly twice across the beet-sugar producing areas of Colorado, and the full length of New Mexico. Nearly all of that travel was done in an automobile which afforded me and my assistants opportunities to make stops and side trips wherever there appeared to be opportunity to observe the Mexican peon migration and its effect upon the communities into which it was pouring.

The claim that these peons should be admitted in large numbers because their labor is needed on farms, on railroads, in mines, in industry, and elsewhere, is a repetition of the arguments which have been made by the same or kindred interests against every proposition to restrict immigration from Asia and Europe throughout the struggles of the country to protect itself against the perils which such immigration has threatened and in disturbing measure, actually brought.

In every instance, after the country became aroused and carried its restrictive policy farther, such action has proven that the claims of the objectors were unfounded.

A look into the facts of the present situation convincingly argues, as experience has in other instances proven, that sound economic policy harmonizes with the demands of racial, social, and political reasons for restriction. There is now widespread and very extensive unemployment in the United States. A practically unlimited amount of data proving this could be presented, but the fact is too well known to require proof.

I have seen this unemployment in many regions and have noted the disturbing fact that Mexican peons are being employed in great areas of the country at lower wages and under much worse living conditions to the displacement of native white and negro workers. The extent of this unemployment and displacement has been and is extremely distressing.

My effort has been to study this question entirely from the standpoint of the welfare of my fellow Americans and the Nation, now and hereafter. The ignorance, poverty, and lowly condition of these unfortunate Mexican peons and their bad prospects for the future excite pity. If hostility to them has colored my findings of fact or conclusions as to the policy dictated by the public welfare, I have not been conscious of it.

I am quite sure that I have not approached this problem, made these inquiries, visited these regions, and reported my findings as the hired servant of men or corporations, whose object is present money-getting, regardless alike of consequences to their fellow Americans who must toil for the necessities of life and of the welfare of their country and of posterity.

The information I have gathered from all sources mentioned convinces me that the conclusions reached from our joint survey are correct and fully support the policy of our committee in reporting and urging the passage of legislation to restrict the incoming tide of Mexican peon immigration.

IMPORTED MEXICAN PEON LABOR AND THE FARM PROBLEM

I solicit the attention of the Members of this House and others studying this problem while I undertake a brief development of the effect of the importation of these pauper peons upon the farmers and farm life of the southwestern and southern portions of the United States.

The displacement of American farm workers, tenants, and small home-owning farmers, their impoverishment, and the consequent injury to the rural life of the South and Southwest, inevitably result from the lack of prosperity among American farmers. These are to a large extent caused by unfavorable marketing conditions under which farm products are sold. This last is substantially aggravated by the importation of many thousands of low-grade peons being poured into farms and rural communities. I shall dwell but briefly upon the overproduction of agricultural commodities in order to make plain that the importation of this labor tends strongly to the further injury of the people who have throughout the history of the country, constituted the body of the wholesome farm population of the Nation. One of the several major factors working toward the impoverishment of farmers and people who live by farm labor and from the products of small and moderate-sized farms is the overproduction of their marketable crops, as measured by the consuming and buying power of those to whom they must be sold.

The following quotations from the Agricultural Outlook for 1930, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture January 7, 1930, show this situation:

CATTLE

The prospective increase of beef cattle, and dairy production during the next five years, with little prospect of compensating increases in demand, will tend to depress rather than raise the gross income of farmers.

Grazing is likely to suffer seriously within the next few years from expansion in the number of cattle, particularly in the Corn Belt.

Range growers should guard against losses likely to result from making additional capital investments in the cattle enterprise with a period of falling cattle prices not far away.

WHEAT

Wheat acreage expansion is going forward in the face of competition from many countries of the world and with a possibility of a downward long-time trend of wheat prices.

LETTUCE

With the continued tendency toward the expansion of lettuce acreage, particularly in California and Arizona, the industry is facing a real problem in the orderly distribution of the crop. * * *

Growers should not, however, assume that markets can be expanded sufficiently to absorb a large immediate increase at the present level of prices.

TOMATOES

In spite of heavy losses to the fall crop in Florida and Texas there is danger that the spring planting in these two States and in the Imperial Valley of California is being overdone. * * *

If growers in the early States have carried out the full acreage in the dimensions reported, they face much lower returns than were received in 1929. * * *

Acreage in the second early States (South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas) shows a pronounced upward trend, having trebled from 1918 to 1928. * * *

Any further increase in 1930 appears extremely inadvisable.

ONIONS

Onion growers in most States will find it to their advantage to somewhat reduce their acreage in 1930 as compared to 1929.

CITRUS

A slightly downward trend is now indicated, but production is on a high level, and the industry is still confronted with a difficult marketing problem. * * *

In view of the prospective large increase in production, especially of grapefruit, during the next few years, and the probable depressing effect on prices, only those with a background of wisdom and skill in production that comes from successful experience or adequate training should contemplate new acreage, even for replacement purposes.

This House and the reading public of the United States are familiar with the great effort now being made by the National Farm Board to reduce the acreage of cotton.

A special committee of trained and able business men selected by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Industrial Conference Board to investigate "the condition of agriculture in the United States and measures for its improvement" in its carefully prepared report made in 1927, page 104, said:

It is clear that the overexpansion of our agricultural area due to all these forces is to a large extent responsible for the present agricultural difficulties.

In discussing the unfavorable situation and prospects for cotton growers, the same report, page 68, said:

The situation in cotton is further adversely affected by the great expansion of cotton acreage which has taken place during recent years. The acreage rose from 33,036,000 acres in 1922 to 48,730,000 in 1926. The increase is in the main due to the development of cotton production in the western parts of Texas and Oklahoma. * * *

Under the influence of all these factors one cotton farmer in west Texas or west Oklahoma is able to attend to 100 or more acres of cotton and to produce his crop at a cost far lower than the cotton farmers in the eastern parts of the belt. It is largely the competition from these newly developed regions which is holding the price of cotton at a level insufficient for most farmers in the older cotton sections.

Very much of such crops as lettuce, tomatoes, onions, citrus fruit, and cotton are being grown by this imported labor. Our committee and Congress have been urged to continue the present exemption of Mexico, the West Indies, and Latin America from the quota restrictions of the immigration law in order that the cheap and subservient labor coming from those regions may continue, and that in face of the fact that it augments this overproduction of agricultural commodities. One of the gentlemen who pressed this demand most insistently was Mr. C. B. Moore, manager-secretary of the Western Growers' Protective Association, who advised the committee that the regions and growers represented by him needed some 80,000 transient laborers, in addition to their regular employees, to engage in the production of crops grown in southern California and Arizona, prominent among which is lettuce. Within a few weeks after Mr. Moore had made this statement to the committee the same Mr. C. B. Moore, speaking for the same interests and in connection with a labor strike in those regions, according to a report in the Los Angeles Times of February 19, 1930, said:

Under present strike conditions there is too much lettuce being shipped, and yesterday it became necessary to bring into action the Imperial Valley Lettuce Clearing House in order to restrict shipments to 250 cars a day. * * *

Lack of profitable lettuce markets in the East and other parts of the United States, due to financial depression, may make it necessary for the growers to curtail their shipments further; and if lettuce must be thrown away, the field is the best and cheapest place to leave it. The present price of lettuce is below the cost of production.

The Los Angeles Times, from which this statement is taken, is one of the diminishing number of publications continuing to insist on the admission of more and yet more Mexican peon laborers. Others who have taken substantially the same position taken by Mr. Moore have had their statements overwhelmed by undisputed developments in their own communities which became known to the committee and to the public.

The report of the commission selected by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Industrial Conference Board quoted above points to the enormous increase in the cotton acreage of western Texas and Oklahoma. It could have been as truly stated that large amounts of cotton are being produced on irrigation projects in other southwestern localities during recent years. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] visited some of these cotton-producing irrigation projects during recent months and saw a great acreage now producing heavy crops of cotton, which only a few years before he had seen in sheep and cattle ranches. Large fields of fertile irrigated land are producing several times as much per acre as the average land throughout the Cotton Belt. Towns have grown where only railroad sidings or small stations with a few adjacent cottages formerly existed. Large gin plants, with the yards surround-

ing them covered with cotton wagons and bales of cotton already ginned and pressed, are located where sheep, goats, and cattle grazed only a few years before. Farther to the north and east, in the semiarid regions formerly believed to be unsuited to anything but grazing purposes, are now vast fields of cotton, where an individual hired worker, usually working for a non-resident landowner, can cultivate three to four times as much acreage in cotton as can be tilled by the owner or tenant of the small or moderate-sized farm, who has heretofore produced the bulk of the Nation's cotton crop.

Many of the pleas made before the House committee for the admission of these Mexicans as farm laborers have specified that they are wanted to grub new land and cultivate and gather cotton and truck crops. That class of labor has done most of the work necessary to this great expansion of the cotton-producing acreage. They are undoubtedly adding annually hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of bales to the cotton crop of the Southwest.

It would be hard to imagine anything more absurd than the plight of our Department of Agriculture and the National Farm Board in pointing out the ruinous overproduction of these crops, particularly cotton, while at least some of these same officials have urged the public and your committee to continue, facilitate, and increase the overproduction against which they warn by the admission of alien Mexican laborers to do this work, mainly for speculative nonresident farmers.

Every alien Mexican laborer who helps to do any of this work is in direct competition with native white and colored farm workers, farm tenants, and farm home owners, looking to their own labor and the soil rented or owned and worked by them for a livelihood. Under these conditions there is neither fairness nor promise of success in any effort to induce average tenants or farm owners to lessen their acreage of such crops when they know that their self-restraint will be to a large extent nullified by the increase of production by imported alien laborers working for speculative, nonresident employers.

I am not speaking of real-estate boomers; neither am I including large landowners who want their estates tenanted by peons and peasants; but farmers who, with their families, live by labor on farms, know the situation which I am describing. As showing that farmers in the regions covered by this invasion and elsewhere, see this situation as it is, I now ask that the Clerk may read the following extracts from letters and statements made to me or to me and my colleague [Mr. JENKINS] on this phase of the problem:

If our farmers are raising a surplus why should they import more laborers to create more surplus? (Mrs. Elsie J. Bozeman, county superintendent of schools, Hanford, Calif.)

"Tendency" is too mild a word. It has already gone far toward completely displacing native farm labor and tenants. Only selfish Americans desire Mexican immigration. I have seen constant and increasing evidence of development of a situation very harmful to American life (of a desirable type). (Elmer C. Nash, realtor and school-teaching, Tucson, Ariz.)

They almost clean out white laborers on the farm. They are of no credit to any country. (M. A. Shipment, farmer, Westminster, Colo.)

If the sentiment of the whole people of east and west Texas could be obtained, a large majority would favor the Box bill. The Mexican can take a frying pan, 50 cents worth of beans, a blanket, and work a week. American white people can not compete with their labor. Am above an average cotton farmer of this section. If I can not get my cotton gathered without them, the next year I won't plant so much and neither will others. The reduction in acreage is about all that is going to help us cotton farmers. We ought to favor your bill. (A. M. Coleman, farmer, Roscoe, Tex.)

The large landowners of south and west Texas import this cheap labor into Texas to grow cotton and other farm products in competition with our native-born citizens. How many years will it take, if conditions are allowed to remain as they are, before our Mexican immigrants will hold the balance of power in the election of our State officers? (R. H. Calmess, farmer, Huntsville, Tex.)

Let this committee compare the needs of individual farmers, real Americans, who depend on the land for a living and on whom our integrity as a Nation depends, with those of a few big agricultural companies, not farmers themselves but capitalists, not dependent for a living on the earnings of farms, and decide which is the most legitimate need. (Conrad Frey, physician and farmer, Melvin, Tex.)

The same state of mind prevailed among the early cotton planters of the eighteenth century in regard to cheap labor as represented by the negro slave trade. To-day we clearly see the evils of our negro problem. Farsighted Americans can never allow ill-educated groups to pollute our already polyglot streams with the lowest types of Central Americans. (M. M. Kornfeld, Houston, Tex.)

These * * * and the Southwest Texas Chamber of Commerce are interested in cheap labor, quick profits, and to hell with the good of our country. (J. Middleton, post commander, American Legion, Texas.)

This is one of the reasons that the farmer of Texas finds it impossible to improve his condition. He has to compete with the peon class of Mexicans in raising and selling his cotton crop. I dare say that more than 1,000,000 bales of last year's cotton crop of Texas was raised by such a class of farmers. This is one way of giving the cotton farmers some relief, by placing Mexico and other countries under the same quota applying to European immigration. (M. J. Tibbitt, farmer, Route 1, Victoria, Tex.)

This is to inform you that the farmers of the Rio Grande Valley are 95 per cent for the Box bill. (Charles Worbs, Las Cruces, N. Mex.)

If you can get the Mexican quota you will have done more for the cotton farmers than all the farm boards that could be appointed. The big cotton farmers in south Texas, who plant thousands of acres, make and gather it with Mexican labor. They branch out all over west Texas and wind up on the south plains. All the farmers I have talked with are in favor of restrictions. (T. D. Weddington, aged farmer, Hale Center, Tex.)

I live in the northern part of New Jersey, in the heart of an agricultural district, surrounded by manufacturing cities. There are some Mexicans in this section; not what might be termed a great many. They are not needed on the farms or in the cities. They are degraded, dirty, immoral, and wholly undesirable. (William H. Gould, Route 1, Clifton, N. J.)

The native white laborer and small farmer needs protection against this influx of alien labor. It is the howling minority that clamor for this class of labor. (Ernest Bond, Beeville, Tex.)

As a farmer and one that speaks this Mexican lingo as fast as they do, can say that we got all the Mexicans in U. S. A. than we need, and more, too. (G. N. Wilson, merchant and farmer, Midland, Tex.)

I am writing to you again in regard to the immigration question, because a good deal of misinformation is being sent out by chambers of commerce, land promoters, etc. * * * I have talked with a lot of small farmers, and they are against unrestricted immigration. (F. C. Simon, Harlingen, Tex.)

As tending to prove that the average American cotton grower can not compete with peon Mexican labor, working under prevailing conditions in the production of cotton, I ask that the Clerk read the following excerpt from the Farmers Marketing Journal of February, 1930, showing that cotton production is cheapest where Mexican labor is used under the conditions prevailing in those regions:

One of the counties, Nueces, and one of the best locations in the county, Robstown, for producing cotton cheap, tested the cost out on 10,000 acres for 1929. Here the land is level and the rows long. Two rows at a time have the stalks cut, the land bedded, dragged off, planted, and cultivated by tractor or team, as preferred. The labor, Mexican, is the cheapest in the belt for both chopping and picking. The test was made by the county agent in cooperation with the chamber of commerce and farmers. The per-acre cost for one-third of a bale per acre was \$84.43.

Cotton and truck farmers of Louisiana see this Mexican invasion pouring into or across their State and recently petitioned their Representatives in Congress to see that the bill now pending—the one reported by the committee—is passed before Congress adjourns. I ask that the Clerk be permitted to read the following excerpts from the Oakdale American telling of the movement among the cotton and truck farmers of that region to hasten the passage of this legislation:

The farmers of this vicinity and surrounding territory, in a petition which is being circulated and signed by the farmers, are requesting Congressman R. L. DeROUEN, Congressman from this district, to stand by Congressman Box from Texas and Congressman JOHNSON from Washington, to see that the Box bill is passed before Congress adjourns.

The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned farmers of Oakdale vicinity, hereby appeal to you to stand by your guns and demand the passage of the bill restricting Mexican immigration before Congress adjourns. It is an established fact that these peon people are coming over the river in lots of hundreds, and that the big cattle ranches are being devoted to cotton culture, the owners depending on this cheap imported labor. The cotton acreage movement will amount to a farce unless the flood from across the Rio Grande is effectually stopped."

There is a national movement on foot to decrease the cotton acreage in the South from 46,000,000 acres to 40,000,000, while the farmers of the four Western States increase their acreage, thus forcing the price of cotton down. The farmers of the South are preparing to fight this immigration, and if they don't the old cotton industry of the South will be killed.

During the past fall hundreds of Mexican peons passed through this part of Louisiana going to Arkansas to work in the fields. When they passed through it was stated that they were only borrowing them until the harvest was over, but it was revealed that the largest percentage of them remained in the States.

The Oakdale soil and climate can not be beat anywhere in the United States, and experts have declared the products produced from this territory to be perfect * * * but the farmers can not compete with the Mexican labor and Rio Grande prices on truck shipped to northern markets. (Oakdale (La.) American, March 7, 1930.)

I pass over many other statements of the bad effects of this immigration upon the economic and social life of agricultural people and their communities, which could be quoted if time permitted, to read a copy of what the Colorado State Grange said on this subject during 1929:

Be it resolved, That the Colorado State Grange go on record as favoring an amendment to the immigration laws of the United States so as to provide a restriction and a limitation to immigration from Mexico in the same manner as limitations are now applied to all other foreign countries; and that we favor the passage by Congress of the Box bill, which would set limitations on Mexican immigration based on intelligence, health, morals, and character of the immigrants, and restrictions as to the number to be admitted, to conform to restrictions applied to immigrants from European nations.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit, will the gentleman insert in the RECORD the date of the statement of the Colorado State Grange?

Mr. BOX. I will try to do that. I know it was during the year 1929, and I so state in my remarks. The action was taken by the State Grange at its regular annual meeting, held January 15, 16, 17, 1929. See Journal of Proceedings Colorado State Grange, Fifty-fifth Annual Session, page 55.

Recently the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation held extensive hearings on a proposition for the improvement of rural communities. I now ask that the Clerk be permitted to read a short excerpt from a statement made before that committee about conditions being created by general economic developments among farmers in the cotton-producing regions of South Carolina.

The southern farmer has been starved off the farm and is now flocking to the mills and the centers of industrial activity. There are five or six times as many men clamoring for jobs in the mills as can be accommodated there. (Hearings House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on organized rural communities, Jan. 27, 1930, pp. 24-25.)

As indicating the condition which a Texas worker would find on leaving the farm and going to some of the textile mills of that State, I ask that the Clerk read the following statement prepared by me from a statement compiled October 25, 1929, by the Texas commissioner of labor:

Oriental Textile Mills, Houston, Tex.—Nationality of employees: Americans, 46 per cent; Mexicans, 54 per cent.

El Paso Cotton Mills Co., El Paso, Tex.—Nationality of employees: Americans, 5 per cent; Mexicans, 95 per cent.

San Antonio Cotton Mills, San Antonio, Tex.—Nationality of employees: Americans, 9 per cent; Mexicans, 91 per cent.

The situation created by this immigration has been growing worse for some years. The survey made by me and the gentleman from Ohio, my colleague on the committee [Mr. JENKINS], shows that it still exists and has been growing worse during recent months. The law now in force, which I sought to have applied to Mexico and other countries of the Western Hemisphere, was enacted in 1924. Those who claim that the present law and its enforcement are sufficient to meet the present situation should explain why it has not done so. Immigration from Mexico coming through the stations averaged more than 55,000 per annum from the enactment of the present law to the close of the fiscal year 1929. It is true that during the last six months there has been a great falling off of that portion of this immigration which comes through the stations, but this period is included in a time of widespread unemployment throughout the United States, which invariably reduces temporarily the number of incoming immigrants.

Unemployment and hunger, from which thousands of Mexican immigrants suffer while in the United States during periods of unemployment, check the coming of such immigrants. During recent months many have been so hungry that they have been seen feeding from garbage cans in back alleys in several American cities. Of course, that checks immigration. A revival of industry always increases the number of such immigrants, unless the law fixes quotas as is proposed in the pending bill.

The volume of Mexican immigration fluctuates under many influences, one of which is revolutionary disturbance. There has not been a revolution in Mexico within the last six or eight months, which would at least partially account for a decrease in Mexican immigration. The rising and falling of the volume of Mexican immigration is not entirely controlled by the discretion of any department of the Government as to

whether it will enforce the law. For instance, during the year of 1924 immigration from Mexico amounted to 87,648. During 1925, the next year, the number of Mexican immigrants coming through the stations dropped to 32,378, a decrease of about 63 per cent. Nobody pretends that our State Department was then in an aroused condition, engaged in an effort to enforce the parts of the immigration law for the administration of which it is responsible.

Unless the law is changed, as proposed in the bill reported by the committee, you will have hereafter the same law and the same enforcement organization which you have had while these immigrants were pouring into the country creating present conditions.

If it is claimed that the State Department has been aroused to enforce the law better during recent months, some of us rejoice over the awakening, though it was much belated, and would like to see a statute enacted which will require that the enforcement agencies of the Government hold the figures down to the rate proposed in the pending bill. We want to nail the proposition down. If any of the departments have slept several years of the past decade, we would like to make sure, if possible, that they will be kept awake hereafter.

This legislation is necessary. Your committee believes it, as shown by a report signed by 18 of its 21 members. The country believes it. If you doubt this last statement, get in touch with the people whose support has backed all the restrictive legislation heretofore written.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Is it not the fact that a large number, in fact hundreds, of civic organizations in the vicinity of the Rio Grande, in the southwestern part of our country, for months and years have petitioned our committee for the passage of this legislation?

Mr. BOX. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. GREEN. And is it not the fact, as the gentleman has well stated, that the economic condition not only of that section of the country but of the country generally at this time makes it imperative that we stand for restricted immigration?

Mr. BOX. The demand is imperative. It is a crime against our unemployed, hungry people to have alien people here by the thousands—and there are hundreds of thousands of these people—taking their work at smaller wages and living under conditions which I hope will never confront the American people. [Applause.]

Great questions like the immigration problem are not quickly worked out and settled by legislation properly enforced. Many of them are continuing in their nature. When will the struggle between the selfish special interests and the rights and interests of the people end satisfactorily? The tariff has been in dispute since the time of Hamilton.

The slave trade and slavery were in controversy for 75 years. The contest over the liquor traffic has lasted through many decades.

It is hard to arouse the country and Congress and keep them aroused on this or other important subjects. Chinese exclusion was accomplished only after 25 years of effort, with several administrations and the State Department opposing throughout the struggle. General immigration restriction, as accomplished in the immigration act of 1917, came after a struggle of more than 30 years. The quota act of 1924 was passed after many more years of effort and in the face of the known opposition of the State Department. I hope the success of the effort represented by this bill will not be so long delayed, but its passage will be worth any amount of patient labor and fighting. If the people know their true interests, as we believe they do, they will not become discouraged and not cease to sustain those of us who are fighting against many secret and open opponents and against odds for a cause which involves the welfare of the people themselves and their country now and hereafter. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday last the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and myself entered into a colloquy having to do with the attitude of the Republican Party in Massachusetts on the subject of the tariff. Let me quote the language of the gentleman in a colloquy which he also had with my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STOBBS]. The gentleman from Texas used these words:

One of your spokesmen, sir, was bold enough, as you are now, to say before the Ways and Means Committee, that he understood the Republican position to be that you were for free raw materials and protected manufactures.

In this statement you will notice the gentleman from Texas uses the word "spokesmen," endeavoring to carry the impression to the minds of the Members of the House that the gentleman, who was a witness before the Ways and Means Committee, spoke in behalf of and as the representative of the Republican Party and its attitude in Massachusetts toward protection.

I took exception to the gentleman's remarks, and later on I looked up the actual testimony, and in fact the gentleman from Texas afterwards inserted the testimony in the RECORD. The actual testimony which appeared in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, the statement to which the gentleman referred, and which he put in the RECORD was given by Mr. Henry M. Channing, who represented before the committee the Atlantic Gypsum Products Co. of Boston.

Mr. Channing appeared here as counsel only for that company, but, nevertheless, in the manner which our good friend from Texas is so competent of following, he tried to put in the mouth of Mr. Channing certain words that would indicate an expression of opinion which Mr. Channing himself did not make.

Now I am not a lawyer, but it is my understanding that if an attorney is engaged to represent a client it is his job to talk for that client, and that is what Mr. Channing was doing when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. He appeared as the attorney of the Atlantic Gypsum Co. solely, and not as the spokesman for the Republican Party.

Further than this, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the evidence submitted to the committee at that hearing to show that Mr. Channing is even a member of the Republican Party. I have since checked it up and find that he is, but he did not appear before the Ways and Means Committee as such. He appeared as a member of a legal firm in Boston appearing here on behalf of his client.

Now, even this witness that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] said spoke by the word for the Republican Party, repudiated the very words that Mr. GARNER tried to put into his mouth. Let me quote from the RECORD. Mr. GARNER said:

Well, I say, you want free raw material for New England purposes, regardless of what effect it may have on the balance of the country.

And Mr. Channing's answer was "No."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will not the gentleman read the first question and the answer?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will be very glad to reinsert the whole thing if the gentleman cares to have it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. There is no need to reinsert the whole statement.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not know just what the gentleman refers to. I have the RECORD here where Mr. GARNER extended his remarks.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. GARNER put practically the same question to him, just a paragraph or two above that, and he answered "Yes."

Mr. TREADWAY. Here is the RECORD, and if the gentleman will find it, I will be pleased to read it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think I can find it.

Mr. TREADWAY. So that, in spite of this gentleman coming here as a stranger, not knowing the very clever manner in which the gentleman from Texas handles witnesses, even then Mr. GARNER could not get the witness to testify that he had said something that he [Mr. GARNER] wanted to have appear as his testimony.

He did not do it. Now, in order to corroborate what is said about the position of this gentleman, Mr. Channing, I hold in my hand two telegrams. It so happens that the Atlantic Gypsum Co. is practically a New Hampshire concern, so that Mr. Channing was appearing for the New Hampshire company rather than a Massachusetts company, but that is neither here nor there.

The principal owner of the Atlantic Gypsum Co. is an ex-Governor of New Hampshire. May I interject a word at this point and say that the present Governor of Massachusetts, His Excellency Frank G. Allen, is honoring us by sitting on the floor at this time? [Applause.]

A telegram was sent by our colleague [Mr. HALE] to former Governor Winant, asking for information as to Mr. Channing, and he uses these words:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 20, 1930.

Hon. JOHN G. WINANT,
Concord, N. H.:

Controversy has arisen over Channing's testimony before Ways and Means Committee as to his statement of Republican policy of protection in New England. Who is Channing? Is he a Republican? By what authority or on what information did he assume to speak for Republicans of New England?

FLETCHER HALE.

Now, Governor Winant happened to be, when the telegram was sent to him, in Florida, but his legal representative in Manchester, N. H., wired back as follows to Mr. HALE:

MANCHESTER, N. H., March 21, 1930.

HON. FLETCHER HALE,
House of Representatives:

Winant has wired, asking me to answer your inquiry. Henry M. Channing is Boston lawyer, senior partner Channing, Corneau & Frothingham, 18 Tremont Street, and general counsel Atlantic Gypsum Products Co. Is a Republican; has never held public office or taken active part in party affairs; appearance before Ways and Means Committee solely on behalf of Atlantic Gypsum Co. on gypsum item, and had no political significance. Has never appeared before congressional committees on any other tariff matters. Did not attempt to speak for New England Republicans, nor to define policy of Massachusetts Republicans on tariff matters. Argued that Republican tariff act of 1920 removed duty on gypsum imposed by Democratic act of 1913, and thereby encouraged investment in plants similar to that of Atlantic Gypsum Co., and that Congress should not now reverse this policy, which will wipe out large investments and increase prices of building materials to consumer.

JOHN R. McLANE.

I think that identifies Mr. Channing very conclusively as in no way authorized to speak for or in behalf of the Republican organization, whether in New Hampshire or in Massachusetts.

When the gentleman from Texas secured permission to extend his remarks by printing the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee he included in that a very brief paragraph from the testimony of J. Frank McElwain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. TREADWAY. The inference was the same that McElwain was speaking for the Republicans of Massachusetts. Now, who is McElwain? Everybody who has had anything to do with making tariff bills knows who he is, because he has been an insistent and persistent caller on us for two years.

Here is what the gentleman quoted from Mr. McElwain.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I call the gentleman's attention to the paragraph I was alluding to in the testimony of Mr. Channing. It is as follows:

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Channing, if I understand you, you made this investigation and started these three plants—one in New York, one in New Hampshire, and one in Pennsylvania—upon the theory that the New England idea of protection would continue to prevail, and that they would give you raw material free and give you protection on your manufactured article?

Mr. CHANNING. Yes, sir.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, I do not think that helps the case any; I do not see where that paragraph connects up Mr. Channing as speaking for the Republican Party.

Now, what occurred with reference to Mr. McElwain? I am quoting from the extract which Mr. GARNER put in the RECORD, which will be found on page 5736:

Mr. RAMSEYER. Now, you are asking a duty of 25 per cent on all shoes?

Mr. McELWAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAMSEYER. And boots?

Mr. McELWAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAMSEYER. And you are asking for free trade in hides?

Mr. McELWAIN. Yes, sir.

Then Mr. GARNER calls my attention to the statement and colloquy with the gentleman from Worcester [Mr. STOBBS], which was later taken out of the RECORD, I believe, as not being accurate. There again the gentleman from Texas fails to make out his case that the witness is a representative Republican of the State of Massachusetts. It so happens that his business is done in the State of New Hampshire, and he was here not speaking for the Republican Party in any sense, but speaking in behalf of an organization anxious to secure tariff rates. That is the whole reason for Mr. McElwain and Mr. Channing being present.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman know of any witness who did appear before the committee speaking for the Republican Party?

Mr. TREADWAY. On the tariff bill?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I do not. Perhaps the gentleman does.

Mr. GARNER. That answers the question. No one of them came purporting to speak for the Republican Party, but they came from New England; and they announced the Republican doctrine of New England, namely, free raw material and protection for the manufactures. Would the gentleman agree that the House may consider the Senate amendments to the tariff bill so that he may put himself on record to say whether he does or not?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not ashamed to be put on record, and I am on record in probably every schedule that is in the tariff bill. I do not need to have any further record at the instigation and the whip of the leader from Texas. If that does not answer the gentleman, I will be very glad to answer the gentleman further at some other time.

Mr. GARNER. I still request the gentleman not to make a monopoly of himself, and to give his colleagues an opportunity to go on record.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am very certain that my colleagues on the Republican side of the House will take their Republican doctrine from the Republican leaders rather than from the gentleman from Texas; and he will find that to be true when it comes to a question of referring the tariff bill to conference. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Texas disputed my statement the other day when this colloquy occurred as to what Republican doctrine in Massachusetts and New England is. It is not what he claims it is—that is, free raw materials and protecting the industries. That is not our doctrine. We believe in fair play to all sections of the country, and we in New England are asking only our fair share under the laws and expected laws of the United States in comparison with the other sections of the country. We can not prosper in New England unless the rest of the country prospers. We are only asking the same consideration at the hands of Congress in behalf of New England industry that you are asking us to give to agriculture in the States of the West. Team play, the United States first, last, and all the time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

PROHIBITION—A COSTLY AND FALLACIOUS EXPERIMENT

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. We need a scientific approach to the study of the liquor problem in this country. Too often protagonists, either for or against prohibition, have presented only those facts which support their position, and have ignored or failed to give proper weight to those facts which are unfavorable. The result is a distorted and confused picture. We may well follow Professor Chaddock's counsel:

When several factors are involved in producing a specific result, conclusions should not be drawn from the measurement of only one factor. The attitude of mind should not be that of the debater who counts on stating his case in the strongest possible terms, allowing his opponent to check up and refute by such arguments as he can find. The effort of the scientific investigator should be to weigh and measure every known factor in the problem before hazarding a conclusion.

It must be admitted that the known factors in our problem are relatively few. Before prohibition, it was possible to gage accurately the annual per capita consumption of liquor. Now that the liquor traffic has been outlawed, we must rely on various indexes of intemperance and on Federal enforcement statistics for indications of the amount of liquor available and the continuation of intemperance since prohibition became the law of the land.

Certain indexes of intemperance are accepted by both wet and dry partisans as valid; deaths from alcoholism, alcoholic insanity, acute alcoholic patients treated in public hospitals, and arrests for drunkenness. Unfortunately records of alcoholic insanity and acute alcoholism are available in only a few States and cities. We must therefore rely chiefly on deaths from alcoholism and arrests for drunkenness for an adequate picture of the growth of intemperance throughout the country.

A brief summary of Federal prohibition enforcement statistics for each fiscal year from 1920 to 1928, inclusive, indicates the rapid growth of the illicit liquor industry. The number of pieces of distilling apparatus seized has increased from 95,933 for the first full year of prohibition to 261,611 in 1928. The total amount of liquor seized has increased from 5,805,000 gallons in 1921, the first full year, to 32,474,000 in 1928. Federal arrests of prohibition violators show a similar increase. In 1921, 34,175 persons were arrested for such offenses. With the exception of a slight drop during 1925 and 1926, there has been a steady rise in the number of arrests, culminating in 75,307 in 1928. Convictions in Federal courts have increased

from 17,962 in 1921 to 58,813 in 1928. This is a more significant figure than the increase in arrests.

TABLE I.—A summary of prohibition enforcement
[From annual reports of Prohibition Unit]

Year ended June 30—	Arrests	Convictions	Seizures	
			Distilling apparatus	Liquor, all kinds
1920.....	10,548	4,315	15,416	153,735
1921.....	34,175	17,962	95,933	5,805,297
1922.....	42,223	22,749	111,155	8,622,230
1923.....	66,936	34,067	158,132	14,346,632
1924.....	68,161	37,181	159,176	15,827,189
1925.....	62,747	39,072	172,537	18,716,259
1926.....	58,391	41,154	161,979	28,741,810
1927.....	64,986	36,546	208,073	29,170,831
1928.....	75,307	58,813	261,611	32,474,234

To keep pace with the steadily increasing volume of prohibition cases our Federal district courts have been reduced to the status of police courts. In 1928 convictions of prohibition violators accounted for 70.4 per cent of all convictions secured in Federal courts. The civil cases growing out of prohibition (chiefly padlock injunctions) accounted for 46.3 per cent of all civil cases tried in Federal courts. Resort to "bargain-day" methods in prohibition cases is now an established procedure, for 90 per cent of the convictions in these cases are secured through pleas of guilty. In the greater number of these cases the defendant agrees to plead guilty, on the assurance of the court and prosecutor that a fine and not a jail sentence will be imposed.

The increase in the conviction of prohibition violators and in the amount of contraband liquor seized may indicate either more effective enforcement or that the illicit traffic is outstripping all efforts at control. The fact that all available indexes of intemperance—deaths from alcoholism, arrests for drunkenness, alcoholic insanity, and acute alcoholism—show a corresponding increase, indicates that so far, at least, the enforcement agents are simply taking larger samplings each year, without curtailing or preventing the spread of the illicit traffic.

DEATHS FROM ALCOHOLISM

The steady increase in the supply of contraband liquor is reflected in the rise in the deaths from alcoholism since 1920. In the two years before national prohibition the United States Census Bureau reported a sharp drop in the alcoholic death rate. This decrease continued through the first year of prohibition, but beginning with 1921 there has been a steady rise. In 1920 the rate for the 1910 registration States was 1.2 per 100,000; in 1927 it was 5, an increase of 318 per cent. The 1927 rate is 79.3 per cent of the 1916 rate, the peak year before prohibition.

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS

There is no official tabulation of arrests for drunkenness for the entire country. The Moderation League has compiled the annual figures of arrests for drunkenness for over 500 communities. The figures of the Moderation League have been criticized because no allowance has been made for the increase of population which has taken place from the period from 1914 to 1927. From the records of the Moderation League we have compiled arrests for drunkenness for 385 towns and cities for all years from 1914 to 1927 and have calculated the rate per 10,000 population. The annual population was estimated on the basis of the arithmetical increase from 1910 to 1920. I believe these figures are representative of the entire country, for they include about 26 per cent of the entire population of the country and 51.4 per cent of the urban population of the country. Chicago was omitted from our tabulation because arrests for drunkenness in that city are included with arrests for disorderly conduct.

In the accompanying table is given the rate of arrests for these 385 places. These cities and towns have been subdivided into four groups according to size, with the rate of arrests for each group of cities. For the entire group the rate of arrests for drunkenness shows a decrease from the peak year of 1916 from 193 per 10,000 to 71 per 10,000 in 1920. Since 1920 there has been a sharp rise up to 1923. From 1923 to 1925 the figures are almost stationary, followed by a slight rise in 1926 and 1927. The 1927 arrests show an increase of 106 per cent over 1920, the lowest year. The rate of increase has not been uniform. In towns under 20,000 and in towns between 50,000 and 250,000 there has been a slight decrease since 1923, while in towns from 20,000 to 50,000 and in cities over 250,000

there has been no decrease since 1923, though the increase has been much less marked.

TABLE II.—Arrests for drunkenness and rates per 10,000 population in 385 cities, 1914 to 1927

Year	All places		Under 20,000 population		20,000-50,000 population		50,000-250,000 population		Over 250,000 population	
	Arrests	Rate	Arrests	Rate	Arrests	Rate	Arrests	Rate	Arrests	Rate
1914.....	465,753	187	45,871	218	50,433	197	117,567	198	251,882	176
1915.....	465,730	183	44,665	209	53,141	203	119,979	197	247,945	170
1916.....	502,477	193	43,132	199	58,342	217	140,156	225	290,847	175
1917.....	482,053	182	41,738	189	53,296	193	127,232	199	250,817	171
1918.....	371,142	137	31,514	141	38,084	135	96,030	147	205,514	133
1919.....	281,005	102	30,433	134	27,338	95	71,071	106	152,163	96
1920.....	201,229	71	16,051	69	20,867	71	61,751	90	102,590	64
1921.....	266,576	93	20,779	89	27,226	91	82,829	119	135,742	83
1922.....	358,599	122	26,059	110	34,599	113	107,393	150	190,548	114
1923.....	421,631	141	31,449	130	41,341	132	126,051	173	222,790	131
1924.....	426,309	140	31,616	129	42,961	134	122,007	164	229,725	133
1925.....	436,743	141	31,316	126	46,035	141	121,410	160	237,982	135
1926.....	452,186	144	31,204	124	46,995	141	124,837	161	249,150	139
1927.....	466,806	146	32,051	126	47,425	140	129,449	164	257,881	142

Deaths from alcoholism are a clearer index of intemperance than arrests for drunkenness, for the latter are affected to a very great extent by changes in police policy. If there were a uniform and consistent police policy with regard to arrests for drunkenness the two curves should approximate each other. It is found, however, that since 1923 the arrests for drunkenness curve has tended to flatten out, while the curve for alcoholic deaths has continued to rise. This is shown graphically in the accompanying chart, which gives the death rate from alcoholism for the registration States of 1910 and the rate of arrests for drunkenness for 385 cities.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is not the reason for this difference the fact that a death from alcoholism can happen only once, while a man can be arrested for drunkenness several times?

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. The gentleman states the fact. The preponderance of deaths from alcoholism due to poison liquor under prohibition is what I am emphasizing. A man may be arrested for being drunk and live to be arrested again, but death is by far the more serious, not alone for the man himself, but for his dependents.

Arrests for drunkenness vary greatly among different cities because of variations in police policy. For example, in New York City in 1927 only 11,997 persons were arrested for drunkenness, while in Boston, which is roughly one-eighth the size of New York, 38,794 were arrested for drunkenness. In Pittsburgh, approximately one-tenth the size of New York, there were 31,759 arrests. In Detroit, which is about one-fourth the size of New York, 28,804 were arrested.

LIQUOR CURVES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

In the evidence so far presented it is assumed that arrests for drunkenness and deaths from alcoholism, particularly the latter, are an index of liquor consumption. The record of foreign countries which have dependable data bears out this assumption. Not only is liquor consumption declining in other countries, but arrests for drunkenness and deaths from alcoholism show a similar decline.

The charts which give liquor consumption and, where available, arrests for drunkenness and alcoholic deaths in foreign countries, illustrate not only the close correlation between liquor consumption and indexes of intemperance, but they show that in foreign countries, regardless of the particular form of liquor regulation, the tendency both in liquor consumption and in intemperance is consistently downward. Moreover, except in Finland, which has had prohibition since 1919, the postwar level of consumption and intemperance is far below the pre-war level.

PRESENT CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR

No one knows how much liquor is now being consumed in the United States. From official and trade sources has been estimated, within reasonable limits, the materials which go into the manufacture of intoxicating beverages. From the total production of materials we have deducted the amounts used in legitimate industries. This leaves the amount which probably goes into the manufacture of intoxicating beverages. For wine and beer this process is fairly simple and reliable. In the case of spirits, however, many baffling problems are presented.

The estimate of beer production is based on the hop crop. After allowing for exports and for amounts used in near beer,

the net balance available for real beer was 12,000,000 pounds in 1926 and 20,000,000 in 1928. Allowing 0.75 pound of hops for each barrel of beer, the probable annual output of real beer is somewhere between 425,000,000 and 630,000,000 gallons. The per capita production is about 5 gallons, one-fourth of the pre-prohibition rate.

In the estimate of the amount of grapes used in wine making, there has been deducted from the total crop 25 pounds per capita for all other uses. This is a liberal allowance, for in 1917 the per capita figure for table use and unfermented juice was less than 19 pounds. On this basis, 980,000 tons were available for wine making. This accounts for 147,000,000 gallons of wine. This is over twice the pre-war quota.

Most spirits are distilled from corn sugar, and directly from grains and fruits. Corn-sugar production has increased from 150,000,000 pounds in 1921 to 905,000,000 in 1927. The per capita production in 1921 was 1.41 pounds, and in 1927 it was 7.63 pounds. The only new use we could find for corn sugar is 30,000,000 pounds used annually in the rayon industry. Allowing a per capita of from 1.5 to 1.8 pounds for legitimate use leaves a balance of from 680,000,000 to 725,000,000 pounds in 1927 to be used for distilled spirits. This would account for between 85,000,000 and 90,000,000 gallons of proof spirits.

It is fair to assume that for every gallon of mash seized at least 1 gallon of spirits was made and consumed illegally from grains and fruits. In 1928, 27,000,000 gallons of mash were seized. This is a minimum estimate. Probably as much liquor is distilled from grains and fruits as is distilled from corn sugar. The total spirits consumption now is about equal to the pre-war rate.

This brief outline accounts for the bulk of the illicit manufacture of beer, wine, and spirits. Allowance has also been made for small quantities of smuggled wine and spirits, of wine and spirits for medicinal and sacramental uses, and a very conservative estimate of the amount of denatured alcohol diverted into the illicit traffic, as well as a small allowance of spirits made from ordinary sugar, malt sirup, and molasses.

The following table is the moderations league's best tentative estimate of the probable production of illicit liquor, with estimated retail prices:

TABLE VI.—Estimated expenditure on alcoholic beverages, 1927

	Quantity	Minimum		Maximum	
		Price	Expenditure	Price	Expenditure
	Gallons				
Beer.....	630,000,000	\$0.50	\$315,000,000	\$1.50	\$945,000,000
Wine.....	150,000,000	1.00	150,000,000	2.00	300,000,000
Spirits.....	180,000,000	5.00	900,000,000	15.00	2,700,000,000
Total.....	960,000,000		1,365,000,000		3,945,000,000

It has estimated the cost to the consumer of various types of liquor. Bootleg prices are not representative of the entire country. Homemade beer can be made for less than 50 cents a gallon, and wine can be made from grapes for from 80 cents to \$1 a gallon. Spirits can be made for less than a dollar a gallon. To these minimum estimates has been added an allowance for liquor bought from bootleggers and in speakeasies.

NET SAVING IN THE DRINK BILL

Before prohibition the American Grocer, a trade paper, made reliable estimates of the annual drink bill. Based on their estimates, in 1917, the last typical year, the total drink bill for the country was \$1,817,000,000. From this amount was deducted Federal and State revenues, leaving a net drink bill of \$1,474,000,000. Allowing for the increase in population, it was estimated that if there were no prohibition the probable drink bill to-day would be \$2,500,000,000.

It is believed our minimum estimate of present expenditures is too low, but even this estimate indicates a saving of only \$1,140,000,000.

THE WORKERS' SHARE OF THE DRINK BILL

There is no reliable estimate of the proportion of the national drink bill, either before or since prohibition, which may be allocated to the wage-earning population. The United States Labor Department budget estimates in 1891 and 1918 are obviously understatements of liquor expenditures by workmen's families, for they account for only one-fifth of the average per family expenditure. It is not unlikely that there has been some net gain in temperance among wage earners through the abolition of the saloon. It can not be assumed, on the other hand,

that the disappearance of the saloon has entirely eliminated excessive drinking among workers. Probably 1,000,000 persons are arrested every year for drunkenness. Does anyone believe that all of those arrested were millionaire clubmen or captains of industry? The 18,000,000 industrial policyholders of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. represent a fair cross-section of the wage-earning population. The alcoholic death rate for this group parallels that for the entire country, except for a slight slowing up in the rate since 1926.

INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY

Extravagant claims have been made as to the effect which prohibition has had on increased productivity of labor. It is extraordinary that the 2-volume report of the Committee on Recent Economic Changes, under the chairmanship of Mr. Hoover, which covers practically all of the prohibition period, makes no mention of prohibition as a factor in increased productivity. In that study, Leo Wolman gives an index of output per worker for all years from 1899 to 1927. They compared this index for the years 1899 to 1919 with liquor consumption and find little or not correlation.

Since 1920 there has been a marked improvement in personnel management, improved machinery, shorter hours of work, and better standards of living. These factors, apart from prohibition, are sufficient to account for the increase in productivity which has taken place, though it is impossible to analyze the correlation mathematically.

EFFECT OF PROHIBITION ON SAVINGS

There has been no phenomenal increase in savings since 1920. Particularly is this true if we exclude time deposits, for these represent in large measure the funds of large corporations. They are not savings in the ordinary sense, though they are usually included in reports of savings deposits. The reduction in the reserve required for time deposits by the Federal Reserve Board has encouraged banks to solicit time deposits of corporations and large investors, and has led the latter to transfer demand deposits to time deposits. The tendency has been most marked since 1919.

The average annual percentage increase in all savings deposits from 1910 to 1919 was 7.4. From 1920 to 1929 it was 7.1, a slight decline during the prohibition period. A similar decrease is noted in the average annual per capita savings deposits. For the nine years before prohibition they were 6. Since prohibition they were only 5.5.

The year 1920 does show a marked increase over 1919 in both series. This may be attributed in part to the boom conditions of that year, in part to the fact that Liberty bonds were sold by small investors and part of such funds found their way back to savings banks, and perhaps in part to the fact that liquor consumption was at its lowest ebb in 1920. In any case the 1920 increase has not been maintained throughout the prohibition period.

Prohibition has failed to accomplish the social and economic results which were predicted for it.

The indexes of intemperance, following a decline in war years and the first year of prohibition, show a marked upward trend.

Liquor consumption and intemperance are now at least three-fourths of what they were in 1916, the peak year of the pre-prohibition period, and they are still going up.

Evidence from other countries shows that more progress can be made in temperance reform by regulated sale of liquor rather than by the attempt to impose universal total abstinence by law.

I am very glad at this juncture to pay my respects to Mr. John C. Gebhart, to whose splendid research work I am indebted for not only the statistics which I have freely quoted, but much of the material contained in this speech.

UNITED STATES

Death rate per 100,000 from alcoholism, 1919 registration States, and arrests for drunkenness per 10,000 population, 385 places

Year	Death rate from alcoholism (rate per 100,000)	Arrests for drunkenness (rate per 10,000)	Year	Death rate from alcoholism (rate per 100,000)	Arrests for drunkenness (rate per 10,000)
1914.....	5.3	187	1921.....	2.0	93
1915.....	4.7	183	1922.....	3.0	122
1916.....	6.6	193	1923.....	3.9	141
1917.....	6.3	182	1924.....	3.9	140
1918.....	3.4	137	1925.....	4.4	141
1919.....	1.9	102	1926.....	4.7	144
1920.....	1.2	71	1927.....	5.0	146

CANADA

Per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages in Canada and convictions for drunkenness, 1912-1928

[Published by Dominion Bureau of Statistics]

Year	Spirits	Malt liquors	Wines	Drunk- enness	Rate per 10,000 population
1912.....	1.032	6.649	0.122	53,171	72.1
1913.....	1.136	7.230	.145	60,975	81.0
1914.....	1.103	7.558	.138	60,067	78.1
1915.....	.886	6.234	.102	41,161	52.3
1916.....	.739	4.974	.064	32,730	40.7
1917.....	.703	4.279	.065	27,882	34.1
1918.....	.682	3.425	.101	21,026	25.2
1919.....	.395	3.070	.126	24,217	28.6
1920.....	.608	4.275	.143	39,769	46.1
1921 ¹723	4.048	.126	34,358	39.1
1922.....	.231	4.316	.136	25,048	28.1
1923.....	.204	4.081	.131	25,565	28.3
1924 ²235	4.781	.186	27,338	29.9
1925 ³225	5.200	.220	26,751	28.9
1926.....	.267	5.601	.361	28,317	30.2
1927 ⁴304	5.450	.373	31,171	32.7
1928.....	.425	6.070	.557	33,095	34.3

¹ British Columbia and Quebec Liquor Commissions commenced sales.

² Alberta and Manitoba commenced sales.

³ Saskatchewan Liquor Commission commenced sales.

⁴ Ontario and New Brunswick Liquor Commissions commenced sales.

Except for the census year 1921, the population figures are the estimates of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

DENMARK

Deaths from alcoholism and cirrhosis classified into four types: (a) Chronic alcoholism, (b) delirium tremens, (c) acute alcoholism, (d) cirrhosis

[ABC=United States classification of deaths from alcoholism]

All causes	Actual figures					Rates per 100,000 inhabitants				
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(ABCD)	(ABC)	All causes	(ABCD)	(ABC)	
1876-1879..	11,539	79	57	12	35	183	148	2,310	37	29
1880-1884..	12,603	82	60	12	33	157	154	2,230	33	27
1885-1889..	13,570	80	54	17	42	193	151	2,010	29	23
1890-1894..	14,745	82	48	16	34	180	146	1,980	24	20
1895-1899..	14,149	110	37	13	49	209	160	1,710	24	19
1900-1904..	14,808	122	43	16	61	242	181	1,520	25	19
1905-1909..	15,357	140	55	11	56	262	206	1,370	25	20
1910.....	14,798	147	41	11	63	262	199	1,350	24	18
1911.....	15,567	130	58	13	69	270	201	1,400	24	18
1912.....	14,995	153	21	6	56	236	180	1,340	21	16
1913.....	14,851	96	27	7	60	190	130	1,290	17	11
1914.....	15,344	115	22	8	68	213	145	1,310	18	12
1915.....	15,761	93	19	5	83	200	117	1,310	17	9.8
1916.....	17,552	121	51	3	94	249	155	1,450	21	12.8
1917.....	16,804	56	8	1	76	141	65	1,350	11	5.3
1918.....	18,001	18	1	1	49	69	20	1,420	5.4	1.6
1919.....	16,822	21	1	3	49	74	25	1,300	5.7	1.9
1920.....	17,910	31	3	2	47	83	36	1,350	6.2	2.7
1921.....	15,881	30	3	4	34	71	37	1,140	5.1	2.7
1922.....	17,115	32	1	4	35	72	37	1,210	5.1	2.6
1923.....	16,205	31	2	3	36	72	36	1,150	5.1	2.6
1924.....	16,648	34	6	4	27	71	44	1,170	5.0	3.1
1925.....	16,402	24	1	3	49	77	28	1,140	5.4	1.9
1926.....	16,742	30	3	3	36	72	36	1,150	5.0	2.5
1927.....	17,086	27	3	3	41	74	33	1,170	5.0	2.3

Annual per capita consumption, spirits, beer, and wine, in liters

Year	Spirits	Beer	Wine	Total
1911.....	5.10	1.90	0.18	7.18
1912.....	4.55	1.79	.18	6.50
1913.....	4.14	1.78	.20	6.12
1914.....	4.20	1.79	.17	6.16
1915.....	4.26	1.76	.21	6.23
1916.....	4.34	2.08	.26	6.68
1917.....	1.26	1.88	.21	3.35
1918.....	.20	1.38	.09	1.67
1919.....	.46	1.88	.18	2.52
1920.....	.76	2.09	.18	3.03
1921.....	.51	1.94	.21	2.66
1922.....	.56	1.80	.24	2.60
1923.....	.67	1.86	.28	2.81
1924.....	.74	1.89	.25	2.88
1925.....	.69	1.98	.19	2.86
1926.....	.60	1.84	.22	2.66
1927.....	.57	1.69	.20	2.46
1928.....	.54	1.62	.17	2.33

FINLAND

Arrests for drunkenness and rates per 10,000 of population

Year	Arrests	Rate per 10,000	Year	Arrests	Rate per 10,000
1914.....	33,729	103.2	1922.....	34,900	101.6
1915.....	10,220	31.0	1923.....	46,748	134.7
1916.....	10,179	30.6	1924.....	58,801	168.2
1917.....	9,261	27.7	1925.....	70,305	199.4
1918.....	5,474	16.4	1926.....	73,829	207.4
1919.....	11,475	34.4	1927.....	95,903	267.3
1920.....	27,236	81.0	1928.....	101,036	279.5
1921.....	33,964	99.8			

Seizures by customs officers of alcohol and other types of alcoholic beverages in Finland, rates per 10,000 population

Year	Alcohol (liters)	Other types (liters)	Total (liters)	Rate per 10,000
1919.....	4,360	4,081	8,441	25.3
1920.....	98,582	11,686	110,268	327.7
1921.....	58,932	13,964	72,896	214.2
1922.....	153,101	72,358	225,459	656.3
1923.....	488,767	15,086	503,853	1,452.1
1924.....	511,902	9,179	521,081	1,490.9
1925.....	550,626	9,276	559,902	1,587.7
1926.....	655,781	8,859	664,640	1,867.5
1927.....	629,814	7,544	637,358	1,776.3
1928.....	972,512	13,375	985,887	2,727.2

ENGLAND AND WALES

Convictions for drunkenness and deaths from alcoholism and per capita consumption of spirits for England and Wales

Year	Convictions	Rate per 10,000	Deaths	Rate per 100,000	Per capita consumption of spirits in proof gallons ¹
1911.....	172,130	47.6	—	—	0.61
1912.....	182,593	50.2	—	—	.60
1913.....	188,877	51.6	1,831	5.0	.58
1914.....	183,828	49.7	1,816	4.9	.67
1915.....	135,811	36.7	1,451	3.9	1.64
1916.....	84,191	22.8	953	2.6	1.67
1917.....	46,410	12.6	580	1.6	1.45
1918.....	29,075	7.9	296	.8	1.27
1919.....	57,948	15.8	369	1.0	.30
1920.....	95,763	25.5	591	1.6	.47
1921 ²	77,789	20.5	493	1.3	.38
1922.....	76,347	20.0	471	1.2	.33
1923.....	77,094	20.0	410	1.1	.30
1924.....	79,082	20.4	395	1.0	.31
1925.....	75,077	19.3	372	1.0	.29
1926.....	67,126	17.2	366	.9	.28
1927.....	65,166	16.6	489	1.2	.25

¹ Per capita consumption given for fiscal years ending September 30.

² Figures are based on 1914 population.

³ Actual count.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I am enunciating a certain truth when I make the statement that not since the historic days of the Volstead legislative debate, in which I was a participant, has so much time of the House been devoted to the question of the success or failure of the operation of the prohibition law. It is my pleasure to number among my friends in this body many who are sincerely and intensively on both sides of this question. Of course, my sentiment for personal reasons are with those of my colleagues who believe with me that in the enactment of this legislation the Congress made a grave mistake, as proved thus far by the failure of this law. By a fair and impartial consideration of all the facts concerning this very difficult problem we will eventually be in position to evolve a plan that will extricate us from our present condition, and light the path and show the road that will lead to temperance and sobriety, which all decent people so ardently desire.

Now, my friends, I have presented the facts; and, as I said before, it is only on this basis can we reach any definite conclusions on this perplexing problem. Is this law a success? Has it made for the elimination of drunkenness, of graft, of law defiance? After a 10-year thorough trial, at enormous loss of revenue and tremendous enforcement cost and ever-increasing expense to the Government, has it obtained and does it now hold the approval and indorsement of the people of the land?

The time of our police forces is divided 25 per cent in apprehending burglars, highwaymen, and so forth, and 75 per cent in the futile attempt of hunting rum runners and bootleggers in all sections of the land and sea. In this effort to locate and bring to justice the violators of the prohibition law the agents of the enforcement bureau have not hesitated to encroach upon the private precincts of the home when, in the opinion of such agents, there is even the unsupported evidence that liquor may be found in such a dwelling.

In the belief that in many cases it should employ men of shady reputation to ferret out and detect criminals who are violating the Volstead Act, the enforcement department of the Government are alleged to have employed—perhaps unintentionally to be sure—men whose previous reputations in society would not bear the closest scrutiny, and who by authority are permitted to invade, to search the homes of the decent people of the land. The statement has even been made that the skeleton key of the midnight marauder has been replaced by the badge of many a crooked enforcement agent. From this it was but a step to shooting down suspected people in all parts of our land. The annual report of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment makes the statement in November, 1929, and gives an account of the killings which have occurred at the hands of Federal and other enforcement officers. It publishes a descriptive list of many such tragedies with a brief analysis of typical cases, though admitting the inability to make a complete list of all the outrages. It was estimated that the total number of killings would easily exceed 1,000. This report was subsequently supplemented by the Washington Herald which raised the dreaded figure to 1,300 in the useless effort to enforce prohibition.

As an example of how the press and many of our most eminent medical authorities envisioned the future of prohibition, I quote herewith some opinions published as far back as 1925.

The tremendous increase in the number of deaths from alcoholism, the steady increase in the number of arrests for drunkenness, the constant demand for increased appropriations to enforce the law, the alarming crime wave that sweeps the Nation, the inadequacy of our present jails and penitentiaries, as well as the appointment of numerous additional judges to try men made criminals for committing an offense that is not a crime, are indicative of the impossibility of enforcing an unpopular and un-American law.

The Federal appropriations alone will run into many millions this year, and when we take into consideration the enormous loss of revenue cut off by prohibition, as well as the great loss to our merchant marine, Volsteadism becomes the Nation's most colossal burden and blunder. The United States Coast Guard, which now has an armed naval fleet as well as an aviation squadron to enforce the law, will at the beginning of the new fiscal year have a personnel greater than the United States Navy in the administration of President Cleveland.

Surely, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, we are paying a high price for a fallacious and unworkable experiment.

THE PRESS, THE PUBLIC, AND MEDICAL PROFESSION

There is abundant evidence from the press, the public, and, best of all in this instance, from the medical profession, that under proper supervision, as practiced in the Province of Quebec, there are no harmful or baneful effects from the moderate use of alcoholic beverages. In substantiation of this declaration I quote the following articles, taken from the New York World, Detroit Free Press, and the New York Times in 1925, five years ago.

These statements were true in 1925. They are even more so now, with five years' regrettable experience.

The New York World said at that time:

To what point has prohibition brought us?

We have, first, a law which not even the most light-hearted observer believes is applied to-day with equal justice to rich and poor alike, or can be so applied with all the complicated legal machinery and all the armies of secret service men and all the ships of all the fleets which have yet been furnished to the cause of prohibition. The rich—not only the overwhelmingly rich but the ordinary heads-above-water rich who are most men's neighbors—keep on drinking. They drink what they wish to drink and find its acquisition easy. Nobody pretends that the case is otherwise, that it is true only in incorrigible New York, and that it is not true in cities and towns the country over. It is the first important fact about prohibition that the impetus to break the law comes from those same respectable, well-to-do people who regard themselves as pillars of society.

All over the country the colossal failure of prohibition is recognized by those who see things as they actually exist. The Detroit Free Press, after hoping for the best, is obliged, in the light of recent disclosures, to admit the collapse of the prohibition movement, and says:

How long will it take those in authority to understand that the cure for the conditions that all decent citizens regret lies in a liberal live-and-let-live tolerance and that the unreasonable curtailment of personal liberty can but end in economic mutiny?

One physician's views on the subject of prohibition are voiced in the following article in the New York Times. Dr. Kurt L. Elsner tells Times readers just what he thinks of the whole subject of prohibition:

Strange to say, as much as has been written about prohibition, pro or contra, very little has been said about one side of it, i. e., the harm it has done to the beginning of self-education of the American people in the moderate use of alcoholic drinks. Self-education had begun and was growing nicely. Its seeds had sprouted and were thriving healthily, when, like the proverbial fool, prohibition rushed in and trampled the tender plants under foot.

Also the following article taken from the Rational American, of New York, issue of November, 1925:

Sir William Osler, formerly of Oxford University: "In moderation wine, beer, and spirits may be taken throughout a long life without impairing the general health. I should be sorry to give up the use of alcohol in the severer forms of enteric fever."

Dr. William Edward Fitch, of the Vanderbilt Clinic: "It is the opinion of careful students of the subject that the moderate use of alcohol in health is harmless. It undoubtedly has a place in disease. There are reasons for believing that alcohol actually increases the resisting powers of the body to the poisonous toxins of septic fever."

Dr. Charles Gilmore Kerley, of the New York Polyclinic School and Hospital: "Alcohol is occasionally of great service in diseases of children. Under certain conditions it answers better than any other means of stimulation."

Dr. L. Emmett Holt, of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York: "With many nursing women the use of malted liquors—ale, beer, etc.—increases the quantity of milk and the proportion of fat. There is little doubt that alcohol is at times of much benefit."

Dr. Hobart Amory Hare, of the University of Pennsylvania: "Clinical experience too great to be ignored stands for the continued use of alcohol. The chief uses of the drug are as a rapidly acting equalizer of the circulation and as a systematic support in low fevers and prolonged wasting diseases in old age and in convalescence from acute diseases."

Dr. A. A. Brill, of the University of New York: "Alcohol has an undisputed place in the human physiological and psychological economy."

Dr. Charles E. de M. Sajous, of Temple University, Pennsylvania: "Malt liquors—ale, stout, and beer—contain diastase, which aids the digestion of starchy foods. They are especially tonic in effect."

Dr. George F. Butler, of the Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery: "Atonic dyspepsia and weakened digestion are generally benefited by some form of alcohol. As a pure cardiac stimulant, alcohol is remarkably serviceable. In certain stages of various acute diseases alcohol is one of the most potent and useful remedies."

Dr. Paul Bartholow, of the Jefferson Medical College: "Beer, ale, and porter are much and justly esteemed as stomachic tonics and restoratives in chronic wasting diseases. Alcohol is an important remedy in the various forms of pulmonary phthisis. In convalescence from acute diseases there can be no difference of opinion as to the great value of wine as a restorative."

Dr. Samuel O. L. Potter, of the Cooper Medical College, San Francisco: "In anemia and chlorosis good red wines are almost indispensable. It is an absolute necessity in the treatment of lobar pneumonia. In fevers alcohol is often most serviceable. Some physicians agree with Mr. Lawson Tait, who declared himself fully persuaded, after 30 years of life as hard in work and as full of responsibility as well could be, that the moderate use of alcohol is a necessity in our modern life."

Dr. John V. Shoemaker, of the Medical-Chirurgical College of Philadelphia: "Alcohol is in some measure antidotal to the poison of the bacillus tuberculosis, and it is to this fact that its unquestionable value in prolonging life in phthisis is due."

Dr. John H. Musser, of the University of Pennsylvania: "There is, I think, no rational doubt that small doses of alcohol are at times useful with those that are out of health, for their stimulating effect upon the appetite and upon digestion, and occasionally for their effect upon other functions. When solid food can not be taken, alcohol is our sheet anchor."

Dr. W. Gilman Thompson, of Cornell University: "There are a number of diseases in which the temporary use of alcohol is of positive service, and there are a number of cases in which it is a positive necessity in order to prolong life. Whatever controversy still exists over the physiological effects of alcohol as a food, it is undeniable that in some cases of disease it is clinically indispensable. The value of alcohol in the treatment of fevers is now universally recognized."

Henry L. Eisner, of Syracuse University: "In pneumonia—the experienced know that there are cases in which it is absolutely indicated."

Dr. William H. Smith, of Harvard University: "Influenza: When extension into the lung occurs, supporting measures must be pushed. Alcohol in some form should be given freely."

J. P. Crozier Griffith, of the University of Pennsylvania: "In scarlet fever with cardiac weakness alcohol in some form is one of the most rapid and satisfactory stimulants."

Dr. Julius Grinkler, of the Northwestern University Medical School: "For the obstinate sleeplessness of chronic cerebral anemia nothing equals in efficacy the imbibition of a night draft consisting of either a glass of beer, wine, or even whisky in small quantities."

John Ruhrah, of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Baltimore: "In severe cases of smallpox alcohol may be added to the dietary with great advantage."

Dr. Herbert Maxon King, of the Loomis Sanitarium for Tuberculosis: "Small doses of alcohol in the form of wine, beer, or ale with meals will often stimulate a flagging appetite and enable the patient to consume a normal amount of food. When the carbohydrate content of the diet can not be brought up to the desired quantity, the addition of wine or beer to the diet may be of distinct advantage. As a stomachic in cases of hypoaecidity, loss of appetite, and consequent impairment of digestion, the lighter wines and malt liquors may be prescribed to advantage."

The above statements which were given as far back as 1925 by great men qualified to discuss this question are emphasized by our subsequent experience in the five years that have intervened in the useless attempt to enforce the so-called noble experiment.

In the same year, 1925, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, New York City, said:

The object desired by those who supported prohibition was the suppression of public drinking places and putting an end to the political activities of those engaged in the manufacture and sale of liquors. These two ends commended themselves to immense numbers of the population who did not stop to think what unforeseen consequences might follow.

The saloon has to all intents and purposes been abolished. So far so good. But the liquor traffic flourishes on a scale of almost unexampled magnitude, untaxed and with immense profits, although carried on secretly in violation of the law.

In my judgment the evil effects of the policy adopted by the United States on moral politics and public order far outweigh the advantages. It has become plain to everyone that nation-wide prohibition can not be enforced, simply for the reason that it affronts the judgment as well as the moral political principles of vast numbers of the population, including a large proportion of the most intelligent and most upright.

In addition, nation-wide prohibition has brought in its train a spirit of lawlessness and political hypocrisy and cowardice that is little short of appalling. We are told that by reason of our constitutional law the eighteenth amendment can never be repealed. If so, it is certain to go the way of the fifteenth amendment, enacted after the Civil War, to give political rights to the negroes. In at least 10 States no attention is paid to this amendment, and no attempt has been made to enforce it for 35 years.

Mr. Chairman, more and more our people are coming to a realization of the fact that a change in this obnoxious law is inevitable; that it is unsound, unscientific, impossible.

A BILL OF PARTICULARS

Let me say in conclusion that prohibition as now administered on the statute books has never solved, nor will it solve, the problem of temperance, for the following reasons:

Because its enforcement lacks the support of a majority of the American people.

Because its enforcement is costing the people millions of dollars in increased taxation.

Because it is increasingly corrupting the morals of the people, making them lawbreakers.

Because it has resulted in widespread corruption and bribery of Government officials.

Because it is an infringement upon the liberty and freedom of the American people.

Because it is teaching young girls and boys to secretly indulge in alcoholic stimulants.

Because it forbids pure and harmless beer and wine and substitutes dangerous poisons.

Because it is the cause of increasing deaths from drinking poisonous bootleg concoctions.

Because it is the cause of increasing the pitiful army of victims of narcotic drugs—dope fiends.

Because it was enacted to carry out the wishes of a few and in disregard of the majority.

Because it has made the booze problem rather than economic problems the main political issue.

Because it has created a contempt for all law upon the part of a majority of the people.

Because it is class legislation, depriving the poor of what the rich can easily obtain.

Because it is a violation of the Constitution, the fundamentals of government, and the Bill of Rights.

Because the Volstead Act is un-American, tyrannical, and liberty destroying.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we have been debating the tariff now for more than a year and this seems an opportune time to bring up another matter relating to the textile industry. We had a conference of the textile industries in my district a little more than a year ago. Perhaps one of the most important and effective speeches made at that time was made by a prominent labor leader, and I shall read to you a surprising statement which he made at that particular time:

In Great Britain the work week in the textile industry is 48 hours, with no night work. In the South and some of the New England States the mills run from 54 to 60 hours per week daytime and in many instances run night shifts, comprising both men and women.

These mills are a greater menace to the textile industry and the American standard of living than any competition from foreign countries. They set a pace of competition which, if continued indefinitely, can only end in disaster to all concerned in the industry. They flood the markets with goods produced under worse conditions than prevail in any other country of the first rank.

At present the tariff as a means of protecting the wages, hours, and conditions of the cotton-textile operatives is a complete failure. The scope of the tariff act ought to be extended and contain specific provisions that the conditions under which the American textile operatives work shall at least be equal to the best conditions prevailing in all competing countries.

It was rather surprising to be told that the laws of Great Britain are so much more liberal than our own. While I do not intend to take the time now to read them, I did take the trouble to get the labor laws of Great Britain, and I am very much impressed, as you would be if you were to read them, especially those relating to accidents, conditions of employment, and hours of labor.

I was so impressed by this that when Congress closed its session last year I visited two of the Southern States with the idea of getting a view at first hand of the conditions there relative to labor. I was treated with the utmost courtesy on my visit. I came back with a better idea of the conditions and also with a higher appreciation of the splendid things the people of those States were trying to do in the way of better schools, roads, and general improvement. I must, however, criticize their laws as to labor, as they rely too much on cheap labor and long hours to gain a foothold in industry.

We in New England have lost some of our capital, because concerns from New England have gone South attracted by cheaper labor conditions. I understand certain industries in St. Louis have recently closed their factories there and gone to Alabama because the conditions of labor there seemed to be more favorable than in St. Louis.

It was recently stated in a southern magazine that the greatest calamity that ever happened to the State of Massachusetts has been due to her liberal and humane labor laws, and particularly relating to the hours of labor. It is time now to stir as much public sentiment as we can among those other States which might be called "backward States" to get them to enact laws in conformity to American standards in the employment of labor.

Last week I read an announcement that the Assembly of the State of South Carolina had passed a memorial to the House of Representatives in Washington favoring Federal equal hour work in industry. I have been looking for that memorial to be placed in the RECORD, but my last inquiry brought out information that the resolution failed to pass the senate in that State, and therefore it would not come before us.

Recently a round robin on this matter was sent to Congressmen and Senators by one of the papers of my State. I will not put those replies in the RECORD, because it might prove embarrassing to some of our Representatives. A day or two ago I read what "Senator Sorghum" said about Congressmen going home so often to mend their fences. He said it was because that is where they sat most of the time. That was only a jest. Probably it is not true. I for one would not like to accept the inference.

But when I read these letters written to this newspaper, Congressmen from Maine to California, I am led to think that that jest might be thought applicable in this case. Nevertheless we find many extremely favorable answers. I want to congratulate especially the Representatives from the State of Illinois. They have generally 44 hours in industry at present and hopeful that

it will be reduced to 40, and as Members from both the Republican and the Democratic side from the State of Illinois, labor is greatly heartened by their answers. New England Congressmen believe in uniform hours of labor but may differ as to methods that we must adopt to bring about that situation. However, we all know that we can not bring it about except very gradually unless we have an amendment to the Constitution. When people assert that State rights must not be interfered with in industry it reminds me of their disregard of State rights when those same persons appeal to the great industrial States for large amounts of money for farm and flood relief and other enormous expenditures for the rest of the country. Then nothing is said about State rights. By way of the Federal income tax they have accomplished their purpose. The Constitution does not allow of a State having any customs law or tariff against any other State, or else I am sure Illinois and Massachusetts and other forward States might well say, "We will have a little tariff law against these goods that are produced under such abominable labor conditions as exist in certain States."

How much more time is going to be needed to develop industries in these backward States, so that you must subject women and children to long hours and night work? I was told when I was in the South, "The only way we can make money is to keep the wheels turning all the time. It is not only the price paid for labor, but the machinery must be constantly in motion." Again I say, how long do you need to continue such conditions to get a foothold? I am sure the agitation now being carried on will soon bring about the desired results, and I am here proclaiming better days ahead for New England, when we will not have to compete with our own sister States in such matters. We can not much longer fool the textile wage earner in America. He now realizes that he needs not only a tariff but he needs Federal legislation of some sort to protect us from unfair labor competition in our own Commonwealths.

It may be difficult at the present time for legislators to go on record in favor of a constitutional amendment for an equal hours labor law, but there seems no other way to fully accomplish the result. As far as I am personally concerned, since we are called upon to contribute so largely to the sections of the country which are trying to build themselves up, contributing vast sums of money, I am beginning to believe that we should demand that they be somewhat restricted in some of their efforts at competition, wherein the labor elements, especially the labor of women and children, are involved.

I earnestly hope that others will follow me in this discussion. Two Members of Congress from New England have presented resolutions to the Judiciary Committee, and it is hoped they may have hearings on the matter. It may be that for some time to come we may not be able to convince Congress that we should have another constitutional amendment relating to labor restriction, but there should be agitation, and plenty of it.

Let us not try to fool the laborer in industrial States any longer by a high protective tariff on everything without relieving him of unfair competition by our sister States in the same industry.

I do not like to read these advertisements from the Southern States such as—

Come down here where there is no limitation on hours of labor or night work.

We must all recognize by this time that the very laws of humanity require us to give this matter consideration.

I will close by reminding you that much as we talk about foreign countries, we should read the labor laws of England, where there is an 8-hour day for industry and no night work allowed for women. Our interest in this matter should be aroused at the same time we are taking up a tariff bill brought to us on the argument of better conditions for the laboring man. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I read from a daily newspaper of this date the following:

Validity of oil company merger is put to test. Department of Justice files petition asking court to declare contract violation of dissolution decree. Friendly suit brought in Missouri. Pleading States combination would eliminate existing competition between two companies concerned.

These are headlines over the published statement given out by the Department of Justice on yesterday.

The Attorney General of the United States in refusing to prosecute the Standard Oil Co. and the Vacuum Oil Co. for violating an injunction of the Supreme Court of the United States has thereby indicated that his department expects to set

up two standards for law enforcement in this country. One standard for the rich and another standard for the poor.

Last year there were 54 United States prisoners that were returned to the penitentiary for violating their paroles. In other words, they violated the same principle that the Standard Oil Co. is violating. The Standard Oil Co. is permitted to go free for violating an injunction issued by the Supreme Court of the United States, while these 54 prisoners who were released on parole were returned for violating those paroles. I do not criticize the authorities for returning these prisoners. They were doing their duty. But the same diligence toward performance of duty should be manifested against the Standard Oil Co.

Last year there were thousands of people convicted and sent to the Federal penitentiaries for illegally and fraudulently obtaining from others money and property. The authorities are to be commended for their efforts in protecting the people in this regard. But the same law that is used to put these people behind prison bars for taking a small amount of money and property from other people should be used against the richest concerns of the United States. I say that it is not being used but that the big concerns of the Nation are being granted special privileges by the Department of Justice. The Cottonseed Oil Trust, that illegally and fraudulently obtained from the farmers of the South \$75,000,000 last fall, is allowed by the Attorney General to keep the money and yet not be prosecuted by the Government. This sum of money fraudulently obtained from working people is doubtless several times more than was taken by all the prisoners in the United States penitentiaries to-day for swindling and grand larceny. I would not have these prisoners who committed the crimes of larceny and swindling go without punishment, but I would have used against the Cottonseed Oil Trust and every individual connected with it the same law and the same punishment.

Since the enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, July 2, 1890, twelve hundred and ninety cases had been decided in the United States courts relating to matters arising under, involving, or growing out of enforcement of this act up until the year 1927.

The 1,290 cases involved more than 6,000 points of law. In other words, the antitrust laws of the United States have been construed by the United States Courts from more than 6,000 different angles. No statute has been so frequently construed and from so many different angles and viewpoints as the antitrust statutes, yet the special interests of the country claim that they "do not know where they are at" and want the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice to protect them against prosecutions when they are in the twilight zone of the statutes.

The fact that the statutes have been so frequently construed is further evidence of the fact that there has been a persistent effort to violate these laws.

Christie Benet, a lawyer of Columbia, S. C., who had more to do with organizing the Cottonseed Oil Trust than anybody else, said there was a strong liaison existing between the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice in the organization of trade-practice conferences. Liaison can only mean a harmonious working relation in the sense Mr. Benet used the term. I did not believe that the Department of Justice would condone the organization of these trusts by the Federal Trade Commission, therefore, when I made a speech during the month of February about the Cottonseed Oil Trust I included this statement made by Mr. Benet and stated that I did not believe Mr. Benet correctly represented the facts. I sent a copy of the speech to the Attorney General of the United States and asked him to deny it. He has not until this day entered a denial of Mr. Benet's statement, therefore, I presume that it is true. It is a sad day in the history of the United States when our Department of Justice will harmoniously work in connection with another department of our Government which is organizing trusts and monopolies.

The Federal trade-practice conference work of the Federal Trade Commission is practically new. A majority of these conferences have been held within the last 12 months. The effort to get such conferences held by the big business interests of the Nation commenced many years ago. When the original bill creating the Federal Trade Commission was before Congress in 1914 there was an effort made then to have the bill provide that work such as trade-practice conference work may be conducted by such a commission and business advised when it is violating the law and given a chance to correct the violations without punishment. Congress refused to affirm such a doctrine.

In 1922 another effort was made to have the Federal Trade Commission authorized by Congress to engage in work similar to the trade-practice conference work. Congress again refused to affirmatively approve such work by the Federal Trade Commission or any other department of our Government. In Janu-

ary, 1929, the Federal Trade Commission, in a report made to the Senate of the United States, pleaded for the power of doing just such work as it is now doing in holding trade-practice conferences. The Senate again refused to affirmatively authorize such work.

Notwithstanding these repeated refusals of the duly elected representatives of the people of the United States to authorize the holding of trade-practice conferences, the Federal Trade Commission, without authority of law, is now holding and, if not prevented, will continue to hold trade-practice conferences for every industry that can organize itself to the extent that a sufficient volume can be controlled to create a monopoly.

Never in the history of our country before has a Government board so grossly and flagrantly abused the power intrusted to it. It is organizing trusts and monopolies when its duties are to destroy trusts and monopolies.

The Attorney General of the United States, in working harmoniously with the Federal Trade Commission, is advising with lawyers and executives of the biggest business interests of this Nation as to proposals which they desire to put into effect that are on the borderline, if not entirely over the line, of illegality. The Attorney General has let it be known to the biggest business interests of this Nation that he expects to cooperate with them and has thereby invited them to submit proposed transactions to him for consideration and he will consider said proposals and will advise with them about the same. He is likewise abusing the power intrusted to him and acting in disregard of the will of Congress by doing what Congress has repeatedly refused to approve.

Although the Attorney General is willing to advise with and assist the big monopolies and trusts of the Nation, he tells a Member of Congress who desires to get an opinion from him about an illegal trust that has been formed by the cottonseed-oil industry that it is the policy of the Attorney General to not advise anyone except the President of the United States and certain executive heads of departments.

The Attorney General of the United States, in carrying out his policy to advise big business, is lending his office to the Standard Oil Co. of New York for the purpose of helping that concern reunite the units of the Standard Oil group that was dissolved by an order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

William D. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States, in adopting the policy toward monopolies and trusts that he has adopted, is following directly in the footsteps of Harry Daugherty, a former Attorney General of the United States. Daugherty shortly after he came in office announced to big business that there would be no wholesale indictments against monopolies and trusts, but he would file a friendly suit to test the legality of some of their acts. Mitchell shortly after he came in office announced that he would file a friendly suit to test the legality of the reuniting of the Standard Oil group. It was useless for him to say that no wholesale indictments would follow.

Therefore the present Attorney General of the United States has adopted a policy that will turn our Government lock, stock, and barrel over to the monopolies and trusts of this Nation. This policy will destroy independent business everywhere; it will carry out Harry Daugherty's policy to a letter; it will carry out the plans of big business that Congress has repeatedly refused to approve; it is throwing the cloak of legality around the shoulders of illegal combinations or refusing to take effective action against them; it is letting monopolies and trusts know that if they are caught red-handed robbing the people they will be warned one time without punishment; that trusts are safe until the last warning; friendly suits are brought for friendly monopolies; the department is being used as an agency of convenience for interests that are looking after their own welfare. Injunction suits are being brought to restrain acts when criminal indictments should be obtained; no one serves a jail sentence or pays a fine when the Government wins an injunction suit, but if the Government wins in a criminal case some one must go to jail and pay a fine. I wonder why the department prefers to deal so gently with concerns that are robbing the people and to use the courts for their convenience.

The Federal Trade Commission should adopt as their published policy to big business the following, which would truly represent what they are doing in the light of events:

We believe in getting competitors together and let them determine for themselves what is a fair price. When they decide what is a fair price, there is no power on earth to prevent them from doubling that price or multiplying it by four.

We prefer calling an illegal conspiracy a trade conference rather than use the names of association or institute. The same results are obtained for the conspirators.

We tell Congress that consumers and outsiders are invited to trade-practice conferences to protect the rights of the public. However, big business should not be uneasy about being annoyed by opponents of their plan as only interested parties will be at the conference.

We believe in letting the seller set the price.

Since competitors are all consumers and therefore buy their own products, it is unreasonable to say that they will ask excessive profits.

We believe that you will look after the public interest when looking after your own interest.

We do not believe in the Government interfering with the business. We want to help you carry out what you want to do.

Loopholes in the antitrust laws pointed out to illegal combinations.

As evidence of the harm that a trade-practice conference will do, I invite the attention of this House to a conference that was held for the heating and plumbing industry. Four-fifths of the industry in the United States was represented at a conference held in Pittsburgh, Pa., last May, 1929. This conference was presided over by a member of the Federal Trade Commission. The acts of the members of this industry were approved by the Federal Trade Commission September 23, 1929.

Each conference, in so far as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned, is nothing more than an Amos and Andy meeting. The members of an industry do not care anything about the Federal Trade Commission. All they want is to get the stamp of approval of that commission. Each industry has an organization of its own with committees to interpret all rules that are passed, to enlarge upon them, to detract from them, to amend them in any way they want to, and to issue orders for their observance and enforcement. Each conference is a meeting of competitors having in mind their own welfare, and almost invariably resulting in the setting of prices. I would say at least in 95 per cent of the cases that is the goal of each industry.

In the heating and plumbing industry they had an agreement at the conference that competitors would not sell below cost for the purpose of injuring a competitor or for the effect of lessening competition. This is seemingly a harmless provision, but in carrying it out the committee will determine what is the cost and add in every item that is necessary to make up the selling price. After that is done the committee will notify each industry of its findings and will doubtless warn each competitor that if he refuses to set the price as agreed upon by the committee the Federal Trade Commission of the United States will prosecute.

Immediately after these agreements by this industry were approved by the Federal Trade Commission, and on the same date the large heating and plumbing concerns of America gave notice to their customers that all prices were canceled and that they were operating under all Federal trade-practice rules. Although practically every other unorganized industry has seen its commodity lessened in value, the heating and plumbing industry raised the price on one article that is used for heating purposes more than \$80 (wholesale) at one time.

The Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, disclosed March 8, 1930, that for the plumbing in a 6-room house the price has increased \$4.48—wholesale—the past few months. Of course, for larger houses the cost has increased proportionately. There are two items that are used in small houses that have been increased by this industry \$84.48 during the past few months and doubtless as a direct result of this trust that was formed by the Federal Trade Commission.

September 26, 1929, the Federal Trade Commission approved a conference that had been held before one of its members for the reinforcing steel fabricating and distributing industry. The conference was held at Asheville, N. C., last April.

In this conference competitors agreed with one another to a set of rules that will absolutely permit them to set prices of their products. It agreed in the presence of a Federal Trade Commission representative that they would give notices of all advances in prices or declines in prices, which is a positive violation of the laws of the United States and the laws of practically every State in the Union. They also agreed that they would not dump their surplus stock to the detriment of a competitor. They agreed further that they would adopt a uniform system of cost finding which would have no other effect than the setting of the prices of their products. A committee was appointed that were members of the industry to construe the rules, interpret them, and order their enforcement without reference to any future action of the Federal Trade Commission. It is nothing unusual for this commission to permit industries to organize and recognize exclusive sale contracts that are in positive violation of the laws of practically every State in the Union.

These industries so organized agree and obligate themselves to publish to their competitors the smallest and minutest details

of their business. There can only be one purpose and that is to set the selling price.

The fertilizer industry organized with the approval of this commission obligated themselves that it was unfair trade practice to sell goods at a price which would not give them a return, and that further they would disclose to their competitors every detail of their business that was necessary for their competitors to know in order to set the selling price. Farmers are going to pay a much higher price for fertilizer by reason of this trust.

The Federal Trade Commission even assisted in the organization of a trust for the beauty and barber supply dealers and to permit this industry to agree that they would give notices of all advances and declines in prices of their products. This to enable competitors to set the same price in violation of the laws of the United States.

Even the sled industry, a toy that is used by children, has been organized into a trust by the Federal Trade Commission and doubtless parents of the Nation will be compelled to pay tribute to this illegal combination organized by an arm of our Government in order to get toys for their children to play with.

The bridge builders of the Nation got together recently and permitted themselves to be organized into a trust by the Federal Trade Commission. This industry obligated itself to carry out certain rules and regulations which meant the setting of their selling price. They even went so far as to pass a rule that would have for its effect restricting of territory and they condemned the practice of a concern submitting a bid to build a bridge unless it had been invited to do so. This practice was denounced by the industry as a crime or an unfair trade practice, and the Federal Trade Commission approved this finding. The people will pay an increased price for bridges in the future by reason of this organization.

The Federal Trade Commission organized the Cottonseed Oil Trust that cost every farmer in the South from four to eight dollars on the seed from every bale of cotton produced during the fall of 1929.

The Federal Trade Commission has been called upon to investigate the very trust that it organized. An attorney general of one of the Southern States told me that the representatives of the Federal Trade Commission that visited him for the purpose of getting information about any alleged Cottonseed Oil Trust convinced him that they were more interested in getting up an excuse or find justification for what the commission had already done than they were in getting evidence of a violation of the law.

The people of this country should condemn the practice of Government employees accepting employment with industries when they have in the recent past been employed by the Government of the United States to perform duties that had for their effect the regulation and restriction of rights of this industry.

The information seems to have gone out to the regulatory bodies of the State and Nation by special interests that if they will be good and do what the special interests want done when their term of office expires or when the public desires their services no longer that they will be provided for with a good job at a fat salary.

The Cottonseed Oil Trust was organized July 24, 1928. Almost immediately after it was organized an economist for the Federal Trade Commission, whose duties were related to combinations and restraint of trade, price fixing, reasonable profits, and so forth, resigned and became affiliated immediately with the Interstate Cottonseed Crushers' Association, whose desire it was to put into effect the rules and regulations of that illegal combination.

Shortly after this trust was organized this man, who was connected with the Federal Trade Commission for years, and doubtless intimately associated and intimately acquainted with the members of that commission and their employees, had his name carried in the city directory for Memphis, Tenn., as follows:

Secretary Interstate Cottonseed Crushers' Association.

When the Federal Trade Commission attempts to prosecute this trust, although I am not so optimistic to believe that they will, they will be placed in the attitude of taking proceedings against a man with whom they were intimately associated for years.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. The gentleman has made a rather severe arraignment of the Federal Trade Commission and of the Attorney General's Department. What does the gentleman think of the action of the House when it went them one better and passed the bus bill, which authorizes the formation of monopolies and trusts and exempts them from the provisions of the antitrust laws which were passed to affect everybody? Does

not the gentleman think that is as bad as any of the actions of the two departments he has referred to?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not approve of the passage of that bill.

Mr. GLOVER. I did not either, and I did not indorse it.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not indorse it myself. I believe it had for its purpose the breaking down of the antitrust laws in so far as passenger-bus companies are concerned, and I think an attempt will finally be made to exempt all these different industries from the antitrust laws, exempting as many of them as they can, and then finally using that as an argument for repealing the laws, because there have been so many exemptions from their provisions.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Knowing the gentleman's great interest in the development of a permanent merchant marine, does not the gentleman think it would be good national policy and one that would inure to the interest of the merchant marine if the Shipping Board were to consider in connection with the sale of its vessels to those who for years acted as allocatees and made enormous fees the advisability of securing as large a cash payment as these fees warranted, thus in a manner assuring that the purchasers would try and have to operate for a period of years and avoid the suspicion on the part of many gentlemen over the country that the purchase, with the subvention, is largely for making a killing, to use a good Americanism, instead of for the purpose of building up a permanent merchant marine?

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman that every contract that is made should require new vessels or at least replacements to the extent they would serve the people of the entire United States. If I am correctly informed—and I believe I am, because I got the figures from the Post Office Department—there was one contract let on the Pacific coast from Tacoma, Wash., to Valparaiso, Chile, wherein the United States Government, through the Post Office Department, is paying \$7,000 for every one dollar's worth of service that is rendered.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. And the cash payment should be predicated upon the amount received by the allocatees for operating vessels for the Shipping Board, without any financial risk to themselves and with every prospect of big, huge profits, which they did reap as rich harvests of their astuteness.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, what I wish to say this afternoon will be upon the subject of our protective tariff bill that this Congress has been considering for several months.

Within a few days we shall have before us a somewhat new bill from the one which was passed by this body some months ago. Rates have been changed; some have been increased, while others have been reduced. The bill has been amended in some very material ways, so that when it comes back to this body I shall be delighted and pleased, I am sure, if we may have a chance to consider separately some of the different provisions in the bill; in other words, I am hopeful that whatever rule is adopted for the consideration of the bill, it will provide for separate consideration of the important provisions of it.

In coming to this conclusion I am not unmindful of the fact that the makers of our Constitution provided for the election of the Members of this body every two years, surely, for the purpose of keeping the membership of the House familiar with the sentiment in the different parts of the country with reference to proposed and needed legislation.

Being mindful then of the purposes of the illustrious characters who framed the Constitution, namely, that we should have a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people instead of for certain selected aggregations of organized capital, I am truly hopeful that those who have to do with the preparation and reporting of a rule for the consideration of this bill will desire to carry out, as well as they may, the sentiment that controlled in the making of our Constitution.

At this time I wish to say I am not friendly to our method of originating revenue legislation. I do not like the rules that give eight men on the Ways and Means Committee the power to initiate important legislation like our tariff bill. I firmly believe the rule should be changed so that all members of the committee would be privileged to participate fully and in all sincerity in the preparation of the bill; and then when it is reported to this body our membership should be privileged, under an appropriate rule, to discuss at least the most important provisions of the bill and offer amendments thereto. For a mere majority of the majority members on the committee to prepare the bill and bring it before us, and then to adopt a rule that limits discussion and

consideration to only a few items in the bill, is certainly not in harmony with the idea that dominated in the framing of our Constitution.

We have drifted away from the original idea that governed in the making of the Constitution as it is. When we look back on what we have done in the making of this tariff bill and reporting and acting upon it in the House, it seems to me we would have a lot of trouble in harmonizing our action with what was intended by the Constitution in the enacting of important legislation.

We can go on a little longer, but the time is going to come soon when we will have to stop, and then this pendulum, now drifting toward industrial government, will swing back, I fear, until it goes too far in the opposite direction. It is well for us to compare the way we enact legislation now with that contemplated by the Constitution.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUDSON. Does not the gentleman believe that the industrial condition of the country is to be more and more increased because of the coming of machinery, and that agriculture will practically be industrialized the same as steel or any other great industry of this country is industrialized? In other words, are we not facing more and more the machine age, which means an industrial age?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. In reply to the gentleman, I will suggest that his question is hardly apropos of the question I am undertaking to discuss. The gentleman might ask something about prohibition or something else that I am not discussing.

Mr. HUDSON. I am sure I would get a favorable answer from the gentleman.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I am now discussing merely the method we have of enacting legislation. In my candid opinion too few men originate and get through this body important legislation. A bigger percentage of the body should be privileged to give their best thought and best judgment to the legislation we enact.

Of course, I realize that certain States in this Union, having large population, are entitled under the Constitution to large representation in this body. I realize that they have the power to place upon certain committees their choice of the membership from those States which have the large population. That is perfectly proper; but even so, the whole country is entitled to representation in the consideration of the proposed legislation.

There can be placed such persons on the committee that has to do with tariff legislation—there can be placed on that committee the very men who represent the great manufacturing industries of this country. Then in harmony with this situation, the chairman of the committee may appoint subcommittee chairmen, who are specially interested in important legislation in which certain big States are interested. But when the bill prepared by such men is brought on the floor of the House the whole body should be given the privilege to consider it.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, the tariff bill ought to be considered under the general rules of the House instead of under special rules?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes; that is it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How many years does the gentleman think it would be before the House could get through with the tariff bill if it considered all of the amendments adopted in the Senate separately?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. The gentleman evidently did not understand what I was saying, or he would not have propounded that question. There is a big difference between permitting the consideration of all amendments, no matter how important, or unimportant, on the one hand, and giving reasonable and liberal opportunity for the consideration of important provisions of the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Who is to decide which are the important ones—the gentleman might think that a certain amendment was unimportant, but it might be considered important by 434 Members.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. That might be true, but a majority of the House should determine that. There is a big difference between shutting off practically all debate on the one hand and allowing a fairly liberal debate on the other. A majority of this body has the power to shut off debate at any time and will do it when certain Members want to monopolize the time of the House by speaking too much, as some of them frequently do. The patience of the House will take care of the

situation by proper motion to close debate. In that way we can handle the situation. There is no question but that a majority of the House can control these matters.

Now, I want to call attention to one provision in the Senate bill which we are to consider soon, and that is the debenture plan for the aid of the farmers throughout the country. When that bill comes to this body it will contain a provision for the aid of the farmers of the country.

I warn this body now, both Democrats and Republicans, that if we vote to eliminate from the bill the debenture provision, we will be striking a blow at agriculture that will be heard from.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If the conferees should bring back the question of debenture, and it should be voted on in the House, does the gentleman know how many Republicans he can get to vote to retain the debenture provision in the bill?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Probably as many as we could get on the gentleman's side of the House.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will furnish as many on the Republican side as there will be on this side, we will retain the debenture provision.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I can only speak for one Member on the Republican side of the House, but I will say this, that the debenture provision in the bill that comes to us from the Senate is the part of the bill which will be the most popular part of it so far as the agricultural interests of the country are concerned.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will furnish as many as 90 out of the 263 Members that he has on that side of the House, the debenture plan will be retained in the tariff bill when it goes to the President.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the debenture is of such vital importance to the farmers of this country, how can the gentleman explain the votes of some Members in another body against the bill with the debenture in it?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to explain the vote of a Member of another body. I am merely expressing my views on this piece of legislation. I think the Farm Board should be given the power to apply the debenture plan for the benefit of agriculture. I think it is our duty to do that under the existing conditions with reference to agriculture throughout the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that the adoption of this debenture plan is our only chance now to put agriculture on a parity with industry at this session of Congress, or to even take a substantial step in that direction?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I will say to the gentleman it will be a step in that direction, and I think a most important step, and in view of the declared purposes in convening the special session of this Congress, and of the experiments which have been going on with reference to farm legislation which we have enacted and the success of these experiments and in further consideration of the declarations of the National Republican Convention and the National Democratic Convention with reference to enacting such legislation as would place prices for agricultural products on a parity with those of the manufactures, I think it is our duty to keep our pledges. This particular piece of legislation, the debenture plan, is the only piece of legislation which has been before Congress which would begin to do what both parties promised to do. It is just as important for one of the parties to support this legislation as it is for the other, because both parties declared for the same thing.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman think that President Hoover is keeping good faith in the interpretation of the Republican platform in coming out against the debenture plan?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I will say to the gentleman that I am not placing any construction on the President's duties in this regard. It is the duty of Congress to make the laws, such laws as we who come from all parts of the country know we ought to make, to carry out the platform pledges of both parties.

Mr. GARNER. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Kansas believes it is the duty of Congress to carry out in good faith the declarations of the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties and give relief to agriculture, and that this is the only step and the proper step to carry them out, what has the gentleman to say about the President keeping faith

with the platform when he urges us not to adopt the debenture plan.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I very seriously doubt that the President is under obligation to use a whip, so to speak, upon Congress, to drive us to do something that he may want us to do.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, but he uses the whip to keep us from doing it.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I can not agree with the gentleman from Texas. We are members of the Republican and Democratic Parties and are under obligation the same as he to carry out the pledges of the platforms of both parties.

Mr. JONES of Texas rose.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Does not the gentleman also consider it the duty of Congress to enact legislation which Congress believes is proper, irrespective of any threat of the Executive to veto the legislation?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Surely I do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I wish first to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman from New York asked the question that I had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two more minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman from Kansas will not let the Democratic leader [Mr. GARNER] get away with his attack on the President on the debenture, as said gentleman from Texas has some tall-explaining to do about so many members of his own Democratic Party in another body voting against the tariff bill with the debenture plan in it.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I have not conceded any point that the gentleman from Texas has undertaken to make. I do not think the President has done anything to be criticized for with reference to this particular piece of legislation, and, furthermore, I do not think the President is subject to criticism for any industrial conditions that exist throughout the country. I think they have come about, such as they are, independent of any duty that the President owes the country, either in proposing or in opposing legislation.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The reason for most of the present unemployment and bad industrial conditions is that the coalition in another body delayed the writing of the tariff bill into law. The business institutions of the country can not run their plants properly and to the best advantage when they do not know what that tariff will be. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I do not altogether agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I represent a city district, and I vote for a protective tariff on the product of the farmers because I realize that the problems of the industrial workers and the farmers are mutual, and that when you provide a tariff to protect industrial workers you are going to help the farmers, because when the American workers are working for good wages they can purchase the products of the American farmers. When we provide a protective tariff on farm products the American farmers can purchase the products of the American industrial workers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to suggest the absence of a quorum. I think more Members ought to hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. I am satisfied, without having the entire membership present.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to call the attention of the House to the failure of one of the most important bureaus of the Government to properly function, and in that connection I wish to read some extracts from an order and a supporting affidavit from the southern district of New York by a district judge on certain grand jury

proceedings. It is entitled "Presentment and report by the United States grand jury, January morning session, 1930," on the subject of the narcotic traffic. I read:

At a stated term of the United States district court held in and for the southern district of New York, in the post-office building, Borough of Manhattan, city of New York, on the — day of February, 1930.

Present: Hon. —, United States district judge.

In the matter of the presentment and report by the United States grand jury, January morning session, 1930, on the subject of the narcotic traffic.

On reading and filing the annexed affidavit of Charles H. Tuttle, United States attorney, it is

Ordered, that the United States attorney be authorized to furnish to the Attorney General of the United States and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a summary of the evidence presented before the said United States grand jury in the above-entitled matter, in so far as such evidence relates to the conduct of certain officials and employees connected with the Customs Service and the narcotics bureau. Enter.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In the matter of the presentment and report by the United States grand jury, January morning session, 1930, on the subject of the narcotic traffic.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, ss:

Charles H. Tuttle, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am the United States attorney for the southern district of New York and have given personal attention to the above-entitled matter; that the grand jury of the United States of America duly empaneled and sworn in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and inquiring for that district and constituting the grand jury convened in the month of January, 1930, and continuing their investigation three weeks beyond the termination of the month for which they were empaneled, had had presented before them certain evidence on the subject of the narcotic traffic.

That numerous witnesses, including agents and officers of the Narcotic and Customs Service, were heard during the said inquiry and certain testimony was adduced.

At the close of the inquiry and upon the day when the grand jury adjourned sine die, they attended before the United States district court and made recommendation to the presiding judge, the Hon. —, United States district judge, in the following terms:

Concerning the actions and conduct of certain officials and agents of said narcotic and Customs Service:

"We feel that with the permission of the court a summary of the testimony of the witnesses on this subject should be forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury by the United States attorney, in order that the Secretary may take such summary action in the premises as he deems proper. We respectfully venture to believe that the aforesaid practice merits severe action against all persons responsible therefor."

And, further, in the same presentment, recommended as follows in the same connection:

"Our judgment in these respects has been recorded on our minutes and is known to the United States attorney, who is authorized to communicate it to the proper authorities with the summary of the supporting evidence."

Under the Federal law the minutes of the grand jury are in the custody of the court, and without authorization from the court I would not feel warranted in imparting to others either copies of its minutes or a summary of their contents, but in view of the character of the testimony and in the interests of justice, I think the transmittal as recommended by the United States grand jury, as aforesaid, is justified, in the aid of proper cooperation in the promotion of good government.

I, therefore, respectfully ask that an order be entered authorizing me to furnish to the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a summary of the evidence presented before the said United States grand jury in the above-entitled matter, in so far as such evidence relates to the conduct of certain officials and employees connected with the Customs Service and the narcotics bureau.

Sworn to before me this — day of February, 1930.

This is a rather extraordinary order; an order of a Federal district judge, directing a Federal district attorney to send to the Treasury Department a summary of testimony taken before a grand jury in connection with the official actions of employees of the Treasury Department. I have not heard of such an order in connection with any other department.

Let me read from the affidavit of the district attorney. He states in his affidavit concerning the actions and conduct of certain officials and agents of said narcotic and Customs Service:

"We feel that with the permission of the court a summary of the testimony of the witnesses on this subject should be forwarded to the

Secretary of the Treasury by the United States attorney in order that the Secretary may take such summary action in the premises as he deems proper. We respectfully venture to believe that the aforesaid practice merits severe action against all persons responsible therefor.

Here is a statement of the grand jury of the southern district of New York calling the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury to the fact that actions of his subordinates require severe disciplinary motions on his part.

What happened after that? After this testimony was taken and a Federal judge and a Federal district attorney and Federal grand jurors thought the evidence of dereliction on the part of their employees was of such serious consequence as to merit this extraordinary order, what did the Treasury Department do?

The Treasury Department proceeded to punish the men who gave the grand jury the information and proceeded to transfer and to demote them and to take them away from their families and send them to foreign posts, the very men who showed up the situation to the grand jury. The grand jury is composed of business men in New York, and they spent a lot of time investigating a condition that should have been known by the Treasury Department, and when, having shown to the Treasury Department the rottenness of the situation, the Treasury Department takes the wrong angle of the situation and censures upright men. Two of the men connected with the grand jury, Mr. Parker Sloane, chairman of the grand jury committee appointed to urge the recommendations of the grand be carried out, and Mr. Arthur S. Cox, the foreman of the grand jury, wrote to Secretary Andrew Mellon, saying, among other things:

This committee learns that as a result of the presentment a high authority ordered that a house cleaning be made in the narcotic bureau from top to bottom. What has happened? The offenders have been transferred to soft berths, while the honest agents, without whose testimony the sore spot could not be uncovered, have apparently been punished for their testimony and on a day's notice have been obliged to break up their homes, receiving arbitrary assignments to remote posts.

These transfers can only be viewed in the light of reprisals for information furnished to the United States attorney and grand jury, and such action is unworthy of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States directly in charge of these matters.

We do not believe in reprisals for honest work, and if the conscientious public servants are to be disciplined for giving information as to dereliction or worse on the part of their coworkers or superior officers future investigations by the United States attorneys and grand juries will likely be barren of results.

What a ridiculous position for the higher officials of the Treasury Department to take to enforce the law, to give soft berths to the very men against whom the grand jury filed a general presentment, and to discipline the very men who have been upright and loyal and courageous enough to give the information to the grand jury! I wonder whether Mr. Andrew Mellon would promote men in his bank against whom testimony showing that they were unfit was given. I wonder if he would throw out and dump the honest men in his bank and advance the other fellows.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I think also the officials in that bureau, going right up to the head of the bureau, were people of Boston, and not of New York.

Mr. BLACK. Yes. I understand that one of these men in the narcotics bureau said Congress was to blame for the inefficiency in the enforcement of the law. It was stated that Col. L. C. Nutt, former deputy commissioner in charge of the narcotic headquarters at Washington, had said that Congressmen and Senators interfered with the administration of the narcotic law, naming several United States Senators. It was also brought out that one of the men employed in the enforcement of the narcotic work was himself a drug addict at one time. The department says he had been cured, but he is in charge of the drugs that were seized by Government agents and which were supposed to be destroyed. I understand, too, that instead of the proper disposition being made of these drugs, substitutes were used for the seized drugs, and that these substitutes have been destroyed. Nobody knows what became of the narcotics.

I have a resolution which I have introduced to investigate the narcotics bureau, and that resolution is pending before the Committee on Rules. Charges have been made against certain employees. The administration ought to want this investigation to be made. I also want to know what happened to the seized drugs; whether they are turned back; whether official peddlers are competing with unofficial racketeers and others in the disposition of these drugs. The public ought to know this. I want to know why these men who gave the evidence under

oath to the grand jury have been transferred. I want to know why they have been given soft berths. I want to know what happens to agents who have been charged with padding expense accounts. Those things should be known. Congress, inasmuch as it has been charged with interfering with the efficiency of the narcotics bureau, should see to it that this resolution, No. 189, is passed. There is no worse crime than inducing people to become drug addicts. Nobody has any sympathy with the man who distributes drugs. We do not want the Federal bureau of narcotics to be in any way linked up with the drug peddlers. It is one of our paramount duties to see to it that there is a thorough house cleaning in the narcotics bureau.

I understand the district attorney has sent down a summary of the evidence. It will be interesting to watch what the Treasury Department does in the matter of transfers, and in the matter of discipline, in the matter of promotions, after this summary of testimony has been digested by them. I have enough respect for Andrew Mellon to believe he will reverse the position taken by his subordinates after the presentment by the grand jury. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hudson].

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have asked this time this afternoon in order that I might bring before the House something of the merits of the legislation proposed by the bill, H. R. 9986, or what would be commonly known as the "movie bill."

The cinema has become the most influential medium of expression in the world—

Says William Marston Seabury in his recent book.

It is in daily communication with countless millions of people of all degrees of intelligence.

There are 20,000,000 people attending motion pictures per day in the United States. This is about one-sixth of all the people in the Nation. Three-fourths of this vast audience is under 24 years of age, according to the estimate of the Federal Trade Commission. That means 15,000,000 of the younger generation. Hon. John J. Tigert, as National Commissioner of Education and the Federal Trade Commission has declared that the motion picture is a greater influence in the character, habits, dress, morals, and general conduct of our youth than the public school. Yet in spite of the fact that the influence of the motion picture is so great, the producers have almost unlimited license to put before our youth anything that they see fit.

One of the cleverest plans for public cooperation suggested by the Hays office is "Boost the best, ignore the rest." They claim that they are producing wholesome pictures as fast as gate receipts justify. This is untrue, for the best pictures morally have always paid the best. This has been repeatedly proven, year after year, as the lists of best sellers published by the industry have almost invariably been the best pictures morally that they have produced.

However, "Boost the best and ignore the rest" is a wonderful plan to increase the gate returns of the industry, for if we will advertise the good pictures and get every one we can to go to the good picture, they will get all the money they can out of the good pictures. If we will say and do nothing about the bad pictures, but let them produce and advertise the bad pictures, as they so well know how, they will get all the money they can out of the bad pictures. Having gotten all the money they can out of the good pictures and all the money they can out of the bad pictures, they are satisfied, but we continue to get a flood of worthless and worse films to retard and restrict the character development of our youth. Clearly, there must be a plan of activity more productive of desired results.

The moving-picture industry shows signs of nervousness and agitation now that a "big stick" in the form of a bill to control dictatorial trade practices and "movie education" of the public intelligence threatens to fall. The bill introduced by me is a direct result of the cleverness of the industry—Fox, Paramount, Warner Bros., and Radio-Keith-Orpheum—at evasion and defeat of the Federal Trade Commission in its endeavor to eliminate the objectionable practices of alleged monopolistic chain theaters, block booking, and blind booking.

Two suits, numerous hearings, and repeated orders on the part of the Federal Trade Commission have only resulted in many superlatives and promises at the information desk—Will Hays—and flank movements by their legal talent. The Government has become an active factor in a situation which has promise of being a struggle of some magnitude.

The motion-picture industry, with its nation-wide operations, has become by nature a public utility in fact if not in name. It has become as much a public utility as has rail transporta-

tion, electric lighting, and telegraphic communication, though alternatives and substitutes are available in each case. That this status is already attained is evidenced by the industry's yearbook showing the huge extent of their operations.

Every week in this country the pretty girls in the glass box offices sell high-powered entertainment at the tune of 100,000,000 a throw in the 20,500 theaters in this country, while in the same week in foreign theaters, numbering 37,000, we find 150,000,000 people of other countries wondering what happened to the descendants of the Puritans. When the ordinary mortal wants entertainment he can get in line on the highway or pay "four bits" and take a chance on what the production managers give him.

In the search of production and distribution economies the movie men have hit upon the effective scheme of "block booking," by which the local theater manager must buy his pictures—the poor along with the better and best—in blocks of as many as 60, or even 80, without the privilege of choosing what he wants or rejecting more than 10 per cent of the pictures he receives. It is claimed by the independent showman that he has to buy 60 films for 30 showings and take a chance on reducing his dilemma by farming the rest out—if he can.

In other words, the independent exhibitors of this Nation find themselves throttled with the octopus of the trust of the industry. They can not say "We will show within our neighborhood such and such films." If they do, it means they must take a financial loss on the purchase of from 7 to 10 films that they can not show in their places of amusement because of the character of their clientele.

Again and again you may go to an independent moving-picture theater owner and say, "Why are you putting on this kind of a film in this class neighborhood," and he will say to you, "We have to buy them. We have no option. We must buy in block booking, and if we want a certain film that is produced we must take those that we have no desire for to make up a block, and the contents of which we know nothing about."

The result is that the big chain theaters do the booking and take the most desirable films and the neighborhood theater has the choice of dishing out to the kids in the neighborhood what the grown-ups in the downtown theaters can not stomach or else wait a year for something more palatable.

A second practice—that of "blind booking," an old Spanish custom that has all the dressings of a "racket," whereby the exhibitor has to book his pictures before they are produced without a chance to see them and to know whether or not they are suitable for his clientele. It is sort of naïve in its audacity, but they say it works. Afraid of the consequences, the local moving-picture house managers in the United States have been afraid to raise little more than a muffled whisper against such practices. Of course, if the independent does not like this, he can always sell out—to the chain and at their price.

In discussing his bill I desire to point out that the motion-picture industry has shown either inability to manage their own house with the business ethics we demand and insist on or the part of our other big industries or a disinclination to do so. Since 1921 Will Hays and his aides in "pronastication," Messrs. Colonel Joy and Carl E. Milliken, have solemnly avowed as official spokesmen for the Nation's fourth largest industry to purify and elevate that industry along definite and commendable lines, but in the intervening nine years there has been nothing but evasion in a cloud of legal technicalities, and it is my desire to turn the machinery of government and make them do exactly what has been promised for the past nine years.

The very delay on their part has made necessary a form of control. Their contention that box-office sales refute this hardly holds water. It is not the morons and illiterate who keep the movie coffers from getting rusty; rather, it has become the great American recreation, and there is no alternative in the amusement field—you take the canned entertainment whether it offends your sensibilities or not.

The critics of the bill claim that section 14, dealing with the subject matter going into the films, puts up a censorship. It is, however, a bit of byplay aimed to defeat the measure, as is proven by the fact that this section is but the incorporation into the bill of the producers' own code or standard of quality for films adopted in 1921 and reaffirmed in each subsequent year up to the present time, but which the "czar" of Hollywood seems unable to enforce among his four "subjects."

This bill comes to their defense with a Federal commission with the power of the law behind it to help enforce the industry's own avowed intentions and standards. Intelligent cooperation on the part of the producers will effectively dispense with any necessity for censoring action on the part of the proposed commission.

Facts speak for themselves. In the four years from 1924 to 1927, inclusive, the New York censors eliminated 4,825 scenes as "tending to incite crime" and 3,763 scenes as "indecent, or obscene, or immoral, or tending to corrupt morals." In 1928 the Chicago censors made 6,470 cuts from films. When one considers what the Chicago and New York censors left in the pictures, no one can accuse them of being old maidish. But the important fact is that the thousands of communities outside the jurisdiction of the censorship did have these scenes dished up to their children. Of course, they are only children, but their desires of to-day are being molded for their appetites of tomorrow.

The United States is now the world's greatest exporter with motor cars and movies well in the fore. We furnish the little sum of 90 per cent of the world's cinema entertainment, and this inevitable education of our foreign neighbors in "gangster technic" and "wild parties" has been responsible for the fact that 64 per cent of the territory covered by our moving-picture foreign market has increased its censorship restrictions. Further, in 1928, 57 American films were banned entirely abroad. If they were not banned on account of plain rottenness, they were banned as insulting and derogatory to that nationality.

Without a doubt our pictures have stimulated foreign people to want to buy certain machines and other American products, but if, along with these commendable results, they poison the minds of Europeans and South Americans against American culture and misrepresent our ideals and character, the net result can hardly be called an asset. As Doctor Galieni, an eminent educator of Uruguay, said at a dinner during President Hoover's good-will tour of South America, the type of motion pictures coming from our studios constitute one of the main obstacles to a proper understanding between the United States and South American countries. Those people can not know that those pictures suggest and reflect only a small portion of American life. It is not a case of economic jealousy but of social disgust at the great American revelation.

May I read right there from a publication along that line:

Among the statesmen and scholars who have commented upon the seriousness of the misunderstanding aroused by the motion pictures made in the United States and sent abroad are: Herbert Hoover, President of the United States of America; Charles E. Hughes as Secretary of State, United States of America; Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Prime Minister, Great Britain; Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, New York; M. Julien Luchaire, honorary professor of the University of Grenoble, France, inspector general of public education in France, and director of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations; Mr. H. L. Mencken, editor of the American Mercury, New York; Mr. H. G. Wells, author; Mr. Stanley Baldwin, member of Parliament, Great Britain; and Mr. Sidney R. Kent, general manager of Paramount Famous Players Lasky Corporation. Whenever such a group become concerned with a common problem it indicates the desirability of study and possible action.

The big four in the motion-picture industry have displayed a queer combination of business acumen and lack of foresight. The really great American business institutions of this day recognize that the element of public service and responsibility go hand in hand with profits, but these exponents of the erotic contribute only gaudy palaces to the sum total of social welfare.

For nine years the Federal Government and the people of the Nation have been trying by concession, entreaty, cooperation, and, finally, lawsuits, to get this industry to clean house in their business practices and have met with cheap evasion and promises that an older and more mature industry would not countenance.

My bill is now in the Interstate Commerce Committee for consideration, and already the movie men and their press agents wildly shout "censorship" and "restriction of business." The same thing, they forget, was shouted when the Interstate Commerce Commission was proposed. The ordinary channels of government have been unable to cope with the overgrown bad boy and his adroitness. Hence the Hudson bill and loud shouts of "wolf" from Hollywood. [Applause.]

I want to say to the members of the committee and to this House that the bill H. R. 9986 is a bill to place this industry in the column of public utility and under the Federal commission. It can not be handled by censorship of city or State. It is useless, after a film has been produced at great expense, to then, in a city, by censorship attempt to cut out this or that. There should be established a Federal commission that will have the power, through conference with the producers, in the making of the film to say what it shall contain, and thus save thousands upon thousands of dollars that is now lost on account of local censorship.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSON. I yield gladly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I was much interested in what the gentleman had to say about the film industry. Is that not what they are doing now in Hollywood? A censorship board looks over the films and cuts out any part which may be objectionable. If this bill should become law, would not the States have the same right to cut out certain scenes from the pictures, the same as they have been doing, as you have enumerated here? How would the gentleman regulate that?

Mr. HUDSON. I would think that while the right would be there, possibly that would not be true; but let me ask the gentleman from New York this question: The gentleman says that at Hollywood the industry has its own approval board and it passes upon the film as it is brought out. Evidently they have not very much spine, judging from the character of the great majority of films that are produced. But, may I say to the gentleman from New York, I am as much concerned with the Federal trade practice of the industry as I am with its censorship.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not want to talk about the Federal trade practices.

Mr. HUDSON. No. I am not saying that the gentleman is here speaking for the industry or trying to cover up its defiance of the Federal trade act, but the industry is trying to call attention to what they call censorship and pull the wool over the eyes of the people with reference to their block booking.

Mr. BLOOM. These people have the finest theaters in the world in which to show their pictures. As a business proposition, does the gentleman not agree with me that the producers of pictures are just as much interested in getting the best pictures as anybody else—pictures that are clean in every respect to show in their theaters—because if they do not, would they not drive people from their theaters?

Mr. HUDSON. But, let me ask the gentleman from New York, whom I count one of my friends, if that is true, the protests against the class of pictures would have decreased instead of having increased.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is blaming all of this to the Moving-Picture Trust. What percentage of the films on which the censorship boards of New York City and Illinois have acted were independent films, produced by fly-by-night concerns?

Mr. HUDSON. I would say not to exceed 10 per cent, and probably not to exceed 5 per cent.

Mr. BLOOM. The producers are interested in getting out pictures which the people want and in the cleanest way.

Mr. HUDSON. If that is true, they can not raise one single objection to this proposed legislation.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes, they can.

Mr. HUDSON. Does not the gentleman realize that it will save them thousands and thousands of dollars, for they can dismiss our friends Hays, Milliken, and Mrs. Winter, to whom they are paying enormous salaries, from \$100,000 down?

Mr. BLOOM. If you are going to have a Federal commission sit in judgment upon these films and then have every State in the United States sit in judgment on these films, there will not be any films left. They are going to keep on cutting out.

Mr. HUDSON. This commission can simply do what any other Federal commission does—make a standard—and then it will be up to the producers to make their films in accordance with that standard, and they will not have the expense of having produced a film which Chicago will not allow and which New York will not allow.

Mr. BLOOM. But they must wait until a film is finally produced; is not that a fact?

Mr. HUDSON. No.

Mr. BLOOM. Could we have this commission go throughout the country and sit while these films are being made in every part of the United States?

Mr. HUDSON. The producers of the films will know whether they can meet certain standards or not.

Mr. BLOOM. They can not know that, because New York State allows a certain thing to be shown and we take that picture and show it. Then we go out to Illinois and they say "cut that out." New York City puts in what Chicago cuts out and Chicago puts in what New York cuts out.

Mr. HUDSON. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that he is attempting to obscure the issue.

Mr. BLOOM. I would not say that.

Mr. HUDSON. But he knows and I know that if there is a Federal commission you would not have any trouble with State or city commissions.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSON. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I sympathize with what the gentleman is talking about because I was in the New York

Legislature when we had the censorship proposition there. I do not know that censorship in New York has improved the type of films, but really believe that it is certain people in the business who are accountable for the type of films. I do not believe that censorship will protect that. But that is not what I wanted to ask the gentleman about. He talks about this booking situation. Now, has not the Federal Trade Commission, as has been shown in certain litigation which has been brought, adequate power to take care of that?

Mr. HUDSON. Evidently not, because they have never gotten any results from it over a period of years. As the gentleman from New York well knows the Federal Trade Commission has attempted to break up this system of block booking and blind booking. I went into a movie out in my district of Chevy Chase with my boys not long ago. I left halfway through the movie, and I said to the manager on going out: "Why in the name of decency are you showing that picture in this district? You know the people do not want it."

He said: "This is our off night. I had to take this picture with other pictures, and I had to either put it upon the shelf or show it; and this is the night of the week when we have the fewest people present. So I have to show it, but I do apologize to my clientele for showing it. I was compelled to take it in order to get my other pictures."

Now, that is an unfair trade practice, as the gentleman from New York realizes, and we ought to break it up. If we can not do it through the present Federal Trade Commission then we must have a Federal commission especially empowered to do it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not recall what the result of this litigation was, if it is finally completed, but it was my recollection that something had been done about that situation.

Mr. HUDSON. No; I believe not. They can not do it because of the peculiar contract that is drawn, which contract protects the trust and leaves the exhibitor at their mercy. They say, "There is a board of appeal," but they make the board of appeal; it is their board of appeal, and the independent exhibitor has no recourse.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from New York was asking about the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. HUDSON. Well, the Federal Trade Commission has found itself absolutely unable to cope with the situation, so we should have a Federal commission to settle this thing once and for all.

Mr. BLOOM. That arrangement has always been in effect, at least it has always been in effect with regard to theatrical performances; in other words, they book for the season. They can not wait until a moving picture comes out and then book it, because if they did that and then found they had booked a bad picture they would have to close the theater.

Mr. HUDSON. The gentleman is speaking about blind booking?

Mr. BLOOM. That is blind booking.

Mr. HUDSON. But under the block-booking system they know what the film is to be.

Mr. BLOOM. If this movie proprietor knew he had a bad film, does not the gentleman think it would have been better business for him to close his theater than to show the picture and have his clientele protest against it?

Mr. HUDSON. I would have considered that to be the better thing to do. Now, you take Mr. Butterfield, whom the gentleman from New York, perhaps, knows; he owns a theater in my own city and a number of them, and he stands on that statement, that they are helpless, that they must take the film. Of course, he could put such films on the shelf and not show them, but that would result in great financial loss.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman may think a film is a bad film, but 999 people in the theater may think it is a very good film. There is where your censorship comes in, and you can not get everyone to think the same as you and I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HUDSON. In reply to the gentleman from New York, let me state this over again: I am not concerned about the censorship of this matter but I am concerned with this unfair Federal trade practice of block booking and blind booking. I want that done away with, and that is the main intent of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the road bill authorizing \$125,000,000 per year to be used in cooperation with the States passed the House some time ago and was amended in

the Senate. Conferees were appointed and they have agreed to-day and the bill has passed in the House, and no doubt will pass the Senate to-day. This will provide \$50,000,000 from the National Government additional to what has been appropriated for that purpose in previous years and will stimulate road building throughout the country and favorably affect the unemployment situation as well as provide improved roads.

The amendment agreed upon by the conferees provides for a change in the amount of money a State can use of the Federal fund on a mile of road. Fifteen thousand dollars per mile has been the limit under all conditions, but under the amendment adopted if a State has finished the original 7 per cent of her roads she will be able to use \$25,000 per mile of the Federal fund, provided the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of Roads are willing to certify to that amount; but this will not increase the total amount of money received from the Government by any one State.

There have been great impediments to road building in the States on account of the plan of financing because the State treasuries had limited funds to draw upon and the highway departments have been compelled, and some of them are even now compelled, to go out in the counties where the roads are being built and secure all or a part of the funds. This made it difficult to build a continuous road because of one or more weak counties where it was difficult to secure the funds.

The laws in many of the States also provided that the property adjacent to the road should be assessed for a small or a large amount of the cost of the road, and this made it necessary to get the active participation and consent of the people along the road, sometimes levying taxes upon adjacent property that was almost confiscatory.

This plan in the United States of securing money for road building was probably inherited from the English system. A study of road building in Europe indicated to me that in France the central government built the main roads without expense to the subdivisions. In Germany I found similar conditions, and this may be explained on the ground that these countries needed substantial roads for military purposes and the central government provided them. In England I found a situation extending at least up until 1923, where the central government went out to the subdivisions for a considerable part of the cost of the roads.

Originally in road building in the United States the farmers were the most interested parties, as they wanted a road to get back and forth from town, and they furnished the land free of charge that was to be occupied by the roads. They were assessed the entire cost of building the roads and making the original pikes.

When the expensive road building became necessary on account of the automobile, the States gradually assumed a part of the burden—some of them 50 per cent of the cost—and continued to collect the balance of the money in the counties, assessing the counties a certain proportion, the townships a certain proportion, and the adjacent property another proportion; but all of these local assessments were largely collected from the land.

In Ohio, at least two-thirds of the cost of the roads, outside of the amount contributed by the States, was collected off of the land, and road building became a great burden to the farmers.

The original idea that the roads in the country were for the benefit of the farmer was still guiding legislation to too great a degree, because the automobile had changed the situation, and roads had become more important to the city population than they were to the country. How was this to be proven?

For Ohio, we asked the Bureau of Roads in Washington to make a census of the vehicles on the roads, and eventually the Bureau of Roads in Washington furnished one-half of the money and the State of Ohio the other one-half for such a survey. When the survey was tabulated it was found that only 12 per cent of the vehicles on the roads were farmer owned and 88 per cent city owned. This survey in our State served to prove to the legislature that the State system of roads containing the main roads in the State should be paid for out of the State treasury, and laws to that effect were passed, but in the meantime hundreds of millions of dollars have been assessed against adjacent property in Ohio for these main roads, and the farmers are still paying these assessments.

In Iowa, I am informed, this same condition prevailed for a time, but the State took over the construction of the main roads at an earlier date and saw fit to pay back to the farmers the assessments of this kind that had been levied.

To do justice to the farmers in Ohio, the State might well consider following Iowa's example.

In many of the States we still find the old laws in force and the highway departments of those States have trouble in financing the projects. This explains why continuous good roads are

so difficult in those States, and the sooner such States take over the burden of building and maintaining the main roads the sooner we will have continuous good roads.

In many of the States the roads are now built out of the State treasury, but the bridges are still paid for by assessing a portion of the cost to the county where the bridge is—generally one-half of the cost. This is an impediment to bridge building and explains why we run against narrow bridges where one vehicle only can be accommodated, serving as a danger place for all traffic.

Overhead construction for railway crossings is on the same basis, and until the States take over the entire cost of making the roads safe as far as the public part of the expense is concerned, we will not eliminate grade crossings rapidly.

Another point is that the States are inclined to widen roads at the expense of farmers, taking additional land without any payment for same, tearing down fences and forcing the farmers to put up the new fences on the new line. When the States determine to pay the expense of these new fences, another obstacle and impediment to road building will be done away with.

The idea that the State road is a great benefit to the farm adjacent has been proven by experience an erroneous theory.

After these roads are built it soon develops that you have something worse than a railroad track along the front of your property. With a railroad track you know that trains come at certain scheduled hours, but the State highway is a continuous performance of fast-moving vehicles that prohibits the use of such a road for ordinary farm purposes. It becomes a noisy thoroughfare with a stream of vehicles only abated for 3 or 4 hours during the 24—dangerous to every living thing that grows on a farm. Teams are no longer being used on such a road and livestock go upon such a road at their peril.

Public need requires such a road and the entire cost should be met by the public. The contribution by the National Government in the way of Federal aid is both wise and fair. The Government uses the roads of the country every day for the distribution of the mail and it is only contributing on the main roads.

Traffic is now interstate to an ever-growing extent and the Nation is under obligation in the matter of interstate traffic.

Finally, in the case of war, mobilization of our resources can be done most easily by the use of the main roads of the country, and these main roads, built for heavy traffic, are a most important factor and part of national defense.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman and Members of Congress, I have introduced in Congress H. R. 8708, which has for its purpose the exclusion of certain citizens of the Philippine Islands from the United States, placing them in the same status as the Chinese under the Chinese exclusion act of 1882 and the Japanese under the Japanese exclusion act of 1924.

One of the gravest problems that has ever faced the people of the Pacific coast is the third invasion of our country by a horde of nonassimilable Asiatics, which has already resulted in very serious and deplorable race riots. Recently the world was startled by dispatches from the Pajaro Valley in California, revealing the intense jealousy and racial hatred which these Asiatic immigrants have aroused.

But, my friends, these occurrences were only what we of the Pacific coast have long feared. The States of California, Oregon, and Washington are more remote from us here in the National Capital than the shores of Maine are from the coast of Europe. These three Pacific Coast States are the outposts of western civilization. Asiatics have always looked with longing eyes on the rich, fertile valleys of these great States, California, in particular, has a mild, semitropical climate favorable to the most diversified agricultural production. In area it is the second largest in the Union, and its industrial development is equal to that of many States in the East. If it had not been for the immigration restrictions which the Federal Government placed against the Chinese and the Japanese, our State would to-day be overrun by these orientals in overwhelming numbers. With the discovery of gold in California in 1849, Chinese laborers began to flock there, so that at a later period it became vitally necessary that very stringent measures be adopted. Consequently, in 1882, Congress passed the Chinese exclusion law. It is well to remember that the preponderant majority of the Members of that Congress had no oriental race problem in their own respective States. They enacted that law solely in response to the earnest plea of their American brothers on the Pacific seaboard that congressional action be taken before the Chinese problem became a nation-wide menace.

During the early part of the present century the Pacific coast experienced the second Asiatic invasion, consisting of

Japanese coolie laborers. This mass immigration of Japanese laborers was welcomed by a certain class of selfish employers who had no scruples concerning the social and economic welfare of their own race. The Japanese, thrifty and ambitious, immediately proceeded to engage in every conceivable business from baker to banker. With astounding rapidity they acquired control, either by lease or by purchase, of vast areas of the most fertile soil in California. They brought their women with them and raised large families. Their wives and children assisted in the work in the fields. During the period when Japanese immigration was at its height there was one school district in the Sacramento Valley in which 80 per cent of the school children were Japanese. So it happened that the white landed proprietor and the white business man joined the white workingman in the movement which resulted in the Japanese exclusion act of 1924.

Now, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, a third problem faces us. Filipino laborers, many of whom were first lured to the Hawaiian Islands by American proprietors of the extensive sugarcane fields and sugar mills, have recently been coming to the Pacific coast in large numbers. Their presence in competition with the white workingman has so roused the latter that he has resorted to unlawful violence and bloodshed. We of California deeply deplore such occurrences, but we must admit that we foresaw them as inevitable. We are now doing and will continue to do our utmost to insure protection for the thousands of Filipinos now residing in our State, but the real solution of this problem, my friends, can be made only here in Congress.

Twenty years ago, in 1910, our census gave the Filipino population of the United States as 160. In 1920 it was 5,603. It is now estimated at 50,000. Those figures are for continental United States.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What would the gentleman say to the suggestion of Philippine independence as a cure for the problem?

Mr. WELCH of California. If it were necessary I would welcome it and vote for it.

In the Hawaiian Islands there are 60,000. In 1928 the port of San Francisco admitted 4,895; the port of Seattle, 1,513; and the port of Los Angeles, 585. Figures obtained from the port of San Francisco show that this immigration in 1929 was 50 per cent greater than in the previous year.

Now, we should take into consideration several facts concerning these Filipino immigrants: Practically all of them are males between the ages of 17 and 25. Less than 4 per cent are females. These Filipinos do not come as colonists. They seek transient labor and their wages are far below those on which an American, particularly a man with a family, can live. At present, unemployment is a very serious problem on the Pacific coast as well as in other parts of the country.

Many employers of labor have turned thumbs down on the white applicant who is over 40 years old and, as I have said before, the Filipino immigrant is under 25. His physique is adaptable to light industry, the only occupation which remains for our great surplus of white workingmen who have passed the age of 40.

It may be asked on what ethical basis we can justify a law excluding the inhabitants of one of our dependencies. It may not be generally known that, if it were not for the immigration restrictions which our Federal Government has long been enforcing to keep Japanese, Chinese, and other Asiatic races from entering the Philippines, the Filipino himself would now have no racial identity. He would have been overwhelmed by other races of invading Asiatics. If we were to withdraw our protecting influence, the Filipino, as a race, would become extinct. Do we not, may I ask in all fairness, have a moral right to protect the racial integrity of our own people by excluding a race which scientists, as well as our own instinct, tell us should not mix their blood with ours?

Due to the absence of any restrictions, Filipino immigration is increasing from month to month. In the very order of things, this problem is bound to become so acute that it will test every power of our State governments on the Pacific coast. It will be increasingly difficult for California authorities to guarantee protection of life and limb, which should be accorded to every human being. I earnestly ask you Members who represent other sections of our country to give us the same consideration your predecessors did on two previous occasions, when they passed the Chinese exclusion law of 1882 and the Japanese exclusion law of 1924.

The demand for Filipino exclusion existed in California long before the recent unfortunate occurrence. The necessity for

restricting the immigration of this nonassimilable race was finally recognized officially by the Legislature of the State of California in the following resolution adopted during its last session:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15—CHAPTER 81

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15—Relative to memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation for the restriction of Filipino immigration

(Filed with secretary of state May 15, 1929)

Whereas the policy of unrestricted immigration as an aid to cheap labor has had a tendency toward destruction of American ideals and American racial unity; and

Whereas this policy has tended to exploit the negroes, the Japanese, and the Hindus, resulting in their regulation or exclusion; and

Whereas Filipinos have not been among those excluded under the immigration laws of the United States in accordance with our national policy of restrictive immigration; and

Whereas the present absence of restriction on immigration from the Philippine Islands opens the door annually to thousands of Filipinos, causing unjust and unfair competition to American labor and nullifying the beneficial results to be expected from a national policy of restrictive immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California earnestly petitions Congress to enact legislation which would restrict immigration from the Philippine Islands; and which will prevent all Filipinos entering the United States who are afflicted with communicable diseases; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be, and he is hereby, directed to send copies of this resolution to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How does the State of California stand on the so-called Box legislation to put the immigrants from Mexico and South American countries under the quota system? I believe that is a more serious problem from a labor standpoint than the Filipino problem in California.

Mr. WELCH of California. If the policy expressed in the Box bill were submitted to the people of California on a referendum, it would carry overwhelmingly. The people of the State of California are absolutely in favor of Mexican restriction.

We have in California an organization of which we feel justly proud. It does not exist for propaganda purposes and it does not serve any special interests in our State. It is known as the Commonwealth Club of California, and it was founded over a quarter of a century ago. It is a fact-finding, not a fault-finding assembly, which conducts an open forum for the free and frank discussion of all problems affecting the social and economic welfare of our citizenship. For that reason, its membership comprises the most intelligent leaders of all social and economic groups. Permit me, ladies and gentlemen, to quote the words of Dr. David P. Barrows, a member of the Commonwealth Club, who, for nearly 20 years, has been professor of political science in the University of California. During four years of his professorship he served as president of that university. Furthermore, he is particularly well qualified to appraise the characteristics of the Filipino immigrant, because he spent 10 years in the Philippines, first as superintendent of schools in Manila, and later as director of education for all the Philippine Islands. At a meeting of the club in May, 1929, Doctor Barrows spoke as follows:

Filipinos are an extremely ambitious people, curious, eager, and ready to make great sacrifices to better their condition and to advance their education. They turn eagerly to our schools. Surprising numbers of them manage, through their own efforts, to complete our high school and even college and university courses. They learn easily, have a real facility for picking up new ideas, and even adjusting them to their own experience; in fact, a facility so keen that it tends to self-deception as to the solidity and validity of their knowledge.

He [the Filipino] makes a good friend—generous, loyal, untiring in friendly services, buoyant, lively. He is a fine companion for almost any kind of adventure.

On the other hand, it is necessary to note what Doctor Barrows says about another phase of Filipino character, which is very relevant to the problem of Filipino immigration:

Their vices are almost entirely based on sexual passion. This passion in the Malay, and which includes practically all types of Filipinos, is inordinately strong, and, in accordance with native custom, it is rarely directed into the channels or restrained by custom or individual will. The irregularity of his conduct and the social problem in American life

which his presence aggravates is, in my opinion, entirely based on this phase of his character.

The evidence is very clear that, having no wholesome society of his own, he is drawn into the lowest and least fortunate associations. He usually frequents the poorer quarters of our towns and spends the residue of his savings in brothels and dance halls, which, in spite of our laws, exist to minister to his lower nature.

The question of his assimilation into our race through intermarriage I regard as wholly inadvisable and inadmissible. * * * I favor our State laws which forbid or discourage intermarriage of American stock and other branches of mankind. The American social problem is already complicated by the presence, in the Western Hemisphere, of three distinct races of man—the Indian aboriginal population, the colored race, and the white. We should not add to the difficulties and complexities of this problem by introducing a fourth element from the Continent of Asia.

As regards the possibilities of legislation controlling and regulating his admission to this country, I am convinced that the powers of Congress are wholly ample and should be invoked. Congress is the only authority which can furnish the regulation that is required. It should be candid, unhyphocritical, and defined on the ground of our interest solely.

* * * I favor the continuance of our full responsibility for the Filipino people, of which immigration into this country is an element, but this immigration should be so regulated and administered that it will be wholesome and advantageous to the Filipinos and to ourselves. It can not be left as it is at present—to do harm to both people and ultimately to convict us of a neglected duty both to ourselves and to them.

Mr. OSIAS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WELCH of California. I would rather yield after I have completed my statement. If I have the time then, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WELCH of California. I would prefer to conclude my statement first, but I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. I wonder if the solution of the problem the gentleman has been discussing would not be to give the Filipinos their independence and then pass proper immigration laws so as to exclude them?

Mr. WELCH of California. If it were necessary, I would say independence in preference to having them come here by the thousands as they are doing at the present time.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman would prefer, then, to grant them independence?

Mr. WELCH of California. If it were necessary.

Mr. GARNER. What does the gentleman mean by "if it were necessary"?

Mr. WELCH of California. I would prefer for the present the means provided by the bill which I have introduced and then have it determined definitely whether the Filipinos are suited for self-government or for independence.

Regarding the legal aspects of Filipino exclusion, allow me to quote from the address of Hon. U. S. Webb, who spoke on the same occasion with Doctor Barrows. Mr. Webb has been attorney general for the State of California for nearly 30 years and has studied this problem very carefully. His statement is as follows:

Prior to 1898 the Philippine Islands belonged to Spain, and the occupants of those islands were citizens of Spain. By the treaty of Paris the islands as such became the property of the United States. By that treaty, whether it be regarded as a conquest or as a purchase, they were ceded to the United States and always, in such cases, the people who occupy ceded territory take on that new civil and political status which the purchasing government chooses to give them.

Sometimes it remains for the grantee government thereafter to provide by appropriate legislation for their status; but in this particular instance there were very few provisions in that treaty. One was that for the period of one year the occupants of the Philippine Islands had the privilege of declaring their wish or intention to remain citizens of Spain, and that established them their allegiance and their citizenship. Failing within that year to exercise that privilege, the citizens of the islands—both the Philippines and Porto Rico—became citizens of the respective islands. Now, mark you, not citizens of the United States, but citizens of the islands.

Reduced to the singular, the Filipino who failed to exercise his privilege to remain a citizen of Spain became a citizen of the Philippine Islands, subject, however, to the power of the United States, as expressed in the treaty, to provide for their political and civil status, which, it occurs to me, can only be construed properly to imply that, in so far as their political rights were to be determined, it remained for the United States, by subsequent legislation of its Congress, to determine that.

In so far as the civil rights were involved by the legislation of Congress subsequent to the enactment of the treaty, Congress would deter-

mine. But in ceasing to be citizens of Spain they did not gain a citizenship in the United States. They ceased to be citizens of any organized government. They became then the other class—subjects—and have remained until the present time subjects of the United States, entitled to such privileges, such rights, and such provisions as may be determined should be extended to them through congressional enactment.

Every citizen of the United States within the territorial limits of the United States stands alike before the law and alike under the Constitution. The Constitution presses upon each and extends its protection to each in like measure, with but slight qualifications. It is affirmed over and over again that even citizens may be grouped, may be divided into classes engaged in particular occupations or possessing certain peculiar qualifications applicable to a class, and when that line of demarcation exists the right to legislate differently for one class or group of citizens from another class or group of citizens has been affirmed to exist under the Constitution.

But those rights, sacred and inalienable, are reserved to the citizens of the United States and not to those who chance to be subjects. The Filipino through the accident of war was found on the islands and the United States assumed the responsibility for this continuance somewhere, and assumed a responsibility for the exercise, toward him of human policy, a policy recognized by international law, and assumed an obligation to take care of him in some fashion appropriate, so long as it continued to own the islands, and I say "own," and I say that deliberately and I use it in the sense of proprietorship.

The United States actually owns the Philippine Islands as proprietor, and to exercise dominion, that is the right to govern and control the islands and all things upon them because it owns them. It does not own the territories that have been incorporated into the governmental existence of the United States, in that capacity. It owns them as sovereign. But the Philippine Islands it owns as a proprietor, a property. It is because of that distinction that I believe the power to adopt legislation, independent of what may be done with citizens, though it may affect the Filipino people adversely in their own view, exists.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, may I state in conclusion: The Dominion of Canada, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Commonwealth of Australia are each a part of the British Empire. Yet each reserves the right to exclude from its boundaries all undesirable races, regardless of the fact that such excluded races are inhabitants of other parts of the British Empire.

For example, Hindu immigration to British Columbia was checked long before it could grow to the alarming degree of the present Filipino immigration to our Pacific Coast States. In 1905 the number of Hindu immigrants entering British Columbia was 45. During the three years of 1906, 1907, and 1908, it reached a total of 2,623. As India had long been a part of the British Empire, such migration from one part of the Empire to the other seemed to be perfectly in order if British citizenship was sufficiently valid. Notwithstanding this seemingly legal obstacle, Canada's attitude was that the Hindus should and could be excluded, even though they were British subjects.

As I have already mentioned, Canada did not wait until Hindu immigration grew to serious proportions. On the initiative of the parliament of British Columbia, the Canadian Government sent Hon. W. L. MacKenzie King to England to confer with the authorities of Great Britain regarding the difficult situation. Before his mission to England, Mr. King had been chosen by the Canadian Government as the commissioner to investigate oriental immigration to Canada and had made a report on the subject. The problem he laid before the British statesmen was not entirely new to them, because they had been called upon before to deal with the question of the migration of different races from one part of the Empire to the other.

It is needless to say that the demands of British Columbia were complied with. Canada's right to preserve that great Dominion as a "white man's country" has been respected by Great Britain, by her possessions, and by all other nations.

It should also be borne in mind that all this was accomplished in 1908, six years before the World War, before Canada's military contribution had made her such a powerful factor in the British Empire.

England has long ago recognized the right, not only of Canada, but of Australia and New Zealand, to protect their racial integrity by excluding nonassimilable races. In other words, the Caucasian populations of the British Empire, bordering on the Pacific Ocean, have been freed from the menace of Asiatic immigration from every source. Have not our Pacific Coast States—California, Oregon, and Washington—the right to demand the same protection from our Federal Government? [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. OSIAS].

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I listened with religious attention to the words of the distinguished author of the bill (H. R. 7708) designed "to exclude certain citizens of the Philippine Islands from the United States," while the Philippine Islands are under the American flag.

I was very much pleased to note exactly the motive that animated the author of this measure and the reasons that prompted him to present this bill, which would make applicable to 13,000,000 people living under the Stars and Stripes, laws which excluded peoples from the Orient like the Japanese and the Chinese.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the United States Congress has the legal power to exclude the Filipinos from the borders of the United States. I recognize, further, that this Republic, the richest, the most powerful Nation now on the face of the globe, can do whatever it pleases with the people inhabiting those distant isles which, by accident or by design, 32 years ago were placed under the protection of the United States. But I raise this point, ladies and gentlemen of Congress: Precisely because America has the physical power and legal right to do whatever it pleases with the Philippine Islands and the Philippine people, I submit that that very reason should address itself to the spirit of fairness and justice of the American people in dealing with the Filipinos, who are relatively weak and small. If we are now to be excluded, my people will naturally wonder whether we have, indeed, been placed under the protection of the United States, when American rule was implanted in the Philippines.

I have been here in this Congress for about a year, Mr. Chairman, and have noted the trend of affairs. I have been pleased beyond measure to note the spirit of generosity and the spirit of justice on every occasion I have been privileged to raise my voice in this the greatest of legislative assemblies. I feel that its membership will not approve a bill so violative of the spirit of justice.

I do not wish now to enter into a very lengthy discussion of this question. I only want to say frankly that the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] does not remedy the evil by his proposal to exclude the Filipinos while we continue under your flag. I say here and now to the gentleman and to the rest of the membership of this Congress that the exclusion of the Filipinos by no means remedies the situation; it only aggravates the evil.

Already the position of a dependency, Mr. Chairman, is more or less bitter, not to say humiliating. It is difficult for an American who has enjoyed freedom for so many years to realize and to appreciate what I am about to say: To be dependent is to be reduced against one's will to the level of an inferior, and ever and always in the relations between a ruling country and a dependent country the eternal question of superiority complex and inferiority complex frequently recurs. Our situation is bad enough, and exclusion would make it much worse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippines has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. OSIAS. I realize that it is perfectly normal, perfectly human, for a citizen of this Republic, for a Member of this Congress, to think of that which will protect the social integrity of the people of his country. But the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is in error when he says that because of the exclusion acts of the United States toward the Chinese and the Japanese we, the people of the Philippine Islands, have been protected.

That is not the fact, Mr. Chairman. The truth is this, the Chinese have been excluded from the Philippine Islands but the Japanese have not been excluded. I want to elaborate upon this for a moment; although the Empire of Japan and the Philippine Islands have been side by side for millions of years and there was no exclusion law to deprive the Japanese from going into the Philippine Islands, by the last official census there were only 7,800 Japanese there. I mention this fact because one of the most persistent points urged against the immediate granting of independence which was categorically promised is the Japanese bugaboo. According to that same census there were about 43,000 Chinese in the Philippine Islands, and I submit the exclusion of peoples of other nations produces unnecessary disturbance of friendly relations. We desire to be independent because we want to enact our own immigration laws.

I remind the distinguished gentleman from California, who thinks that the Philippine question can be solved by the exclusion of the Filipinos from the United States, that my people will interpret that act as un-American. You will admit that

this is a very delicate question, that it goes to the heart, and I very much fear that some of my people will construe the enactment of the bill presented by the gentleman from California as tantamount to heaping insult upon injury. I do not say it is, but you can not prevent some people from thinking that.

I close by saying that the real remedy, the only remedy for the California situation, the real remedy for the labor question between the Americans and the Filipinos, the one remedy for our social and racial relations, does not consist of excluding us from the borders of the United States while we are under the American flag. I do not believe it is fair. I think it is un-American that we should be excluded while we are absolutely powerless to enact immigration laws affecting Americans going to our own country.

The remedy lies in immediately granting full and complete independence to the Philippines. [Applause.] This will be the remedy for the social question; it will be the remedy for the racial question; it will be the remedy for the economic question; it will be the remedy for our political situation. It will also be the remedy for the existing cultural anomaly which, not being eligible to American citizenship and not being free and independent, prevents us from framing a proper educational philosophy that would guide us in our cultural orientation.

A measure such as this is at best only a makeshift. It is absolutely unnecessary. What is necessary is to set us free. If we are to be treated as a foreign people for purposes of immigration, we must first be given the category of a free and independent nation. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, it is a trite but true saying that "if this Nation is to progress it must march forward on the feet of healthy and intelligent children."

No other nation in the world is giving more earnest consideration to the welfare of its boys and girls than is ours. In his address to the Boy Scout leaders of America President Hoover stated:

Together with his sister the boy is the most precious possession of the American home. I sometimes think that one of the sad things of life is that they will grow up. Literature and lore have established our boys in varied relations to life; as a growing animal of superlative promise, to be fed and watered and kept warm; as a periodic nuisance; as a joy forever; as the incarnation of destruction; as the father of the man; as the child of iniquity; as the problem of our times and the hope of the Nation.

In any event he is a complex of cells, teeming with affection, filled with curiosity for every mortal thing, radiating sunlight to all the world; endowed with dynamic energy and the impelling desire to take exercise on all occasions. He is a perpetual problem to his parents; and the wisdom in his upbringing consists more often in the determination of what to do with him next rather than in what he shall do when he gets out into the cold world.

Four million Boy Scouts are now celebrating the twentieth anniversary of "scoutdom" in America. With its call to the out-of-door life, nature study, health and character building habits, freedom from a pernicious environment, and the daily challenge to do a "good turn," this organization has provided for the energetic and red-blooded boy a constructive and pleasant outlet for his activity. The growth of this organization has been great during the past 20 years, yet the field of possibilities is but barely opened.

It was my privilege nearly 20 years ago to be one of the first boy scouts in St. Joseph. Likewise, it has also been my pleasure to be a member of the executive board of the St. Joseph area. As a result of these experiences, along with my experience as a public-school official, I am convinced that, as far as the boys are concerned, there is no single movement sponsored by any organization that has had the wholesome effect on youth as has "scouting." I have great faith in the future of the men of this country as long as "scouting" continues to extend its influence.

There has also grown up in this great country some wonderful organizations for the girls. The same tireless efforts that made "scouting" a success are being directed along the lines of perfecting organizations for girls of the same age.

Every Member of this House could well afford to adopt the principles enunciated and practiced by these organizations of our girls and boys, namely, "Service to and cooperation with the whole group." [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side. I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] whether we may have an understanding that when this bill is taken up again on Thursday next general debate shall be limited to remarks on the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I have applications for additional time, but the gentlemen are not here. I understand the gentleman wishes to enter into agreement that debate will be limited to the bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. Neither side will yield time except to Members who will discuss the bill?

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LA GUARDIA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10813, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ESlick, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McREYNOLDS, on account of the death of his mother.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—CONSIDERATION OF THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, so that the RECORD may show it and thus avoid many inquiries by colleagues on this side of the House who are interested in knowing, I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] at what time we are to consider the tariff bill and the sending of it to conference?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has expressed himself many times to the effect that we should give fair and considerate attention to the 1,250 amendments that the Senate has added to the bill. The bill just came over from the Senate to-day. It is our wish to give the Members two or three days to digest the amendments and find out just what they are. I think we will probably be ready to consider the bill some time the first of next week.

Mr. GARNER. Then may I send out notices to the membership on this side of the House that the tariff bill will be taken up on Monday or Tuesday of next week for disposition?

Mr. SNELL. As near as I can tell, that will be the proper time.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8705. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River at or near Prophetstown, Ill.;

H. R. 8706. An act to legalize a bridge across the Pecatonica River at Freeport, Ill.;

H. R. 8970. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River on Ashland Avenue near One hundred and thirty-fourth Street in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 8971. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to widen, maintain, and operate the existing bridge across the Little Calumet River on Halsted Street near One hundred and forty-fifth Street in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 8972. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River on Ashland Avenue near One hundred and fortieth Street in Cook County, State of Illinois; and

H. R. 9979. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1930, and June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, March 26, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, March 26, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

(10 a. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented and for other purposes (H. R. 10379, H. R. 9304, H. R. 7596, and H. R. 1416).

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish grades and an inspection service for canned foods in order to facilitate commerce therein, and to enable the consumers to purchase canned goods on the basis of quality, thereby lending encouragement to the producers of quality farm products (H. R. 3921).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

To consider proposals concerning legislation on Muscle Shoals.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States (H. J. Res. 114, H. J. Res. 11, H. J. Res. 38).

Proposing an amendment to the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution (H. J. Res. 99).

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a referendum on the eighteenth amendment thereof (H. J. Res. 219).

Proposing an amendment to the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States (H. J. Res. 246).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5646. A bill to exempt from the quota husbands, fathers, and mothers of American citizens; with amendment (Rept. No. 976). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10213. A bill granting the consent of Congress to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River, near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky; without amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10248. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10258. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10291. A bill authorizing the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga.; with amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10340. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10461. A bill authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.; with amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10474. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at

or near Sylamore, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10526. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10651. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3135. An act granting the consent of Congress to Helena S. Raskob to construct a dam across Robins Cove, a tributary of Chester River, Queen Annes County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3621. An act granting a right of way across the land of the United States for bridge purposes over the Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway; with amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3745. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3747. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River; without amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3141. A bill to amend paragraph (11) of section 20 of the interstate commerce act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4293. A bill to provide for a ferry and a highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee of Claims. H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Switzer; with amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2692. A bill for the relief of Francis J. McDonald; with amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Naval Affairs: H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Henry Manske, jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 11093) authorizing an appropriation of \$50,000 with which to procure and plant seed oysters on south Atlantic coast, and particularly along the coast of Georgia and South Carolina, where fresh water from floods and streams have depleted the supply; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11094) to authorize the extension of the natural history building of the United States National Museum; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 11095) to provide for the commemoration of the battle of Westport, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 11096) to provide a postage charge for directory service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 11097) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards for the market classification and grading of livestock and livestock products, to maintain standard grading services therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11098) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate, control, and eradicate avian

tuberculosis, and for other purposes, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11099) to regulate the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11100) to amend section 670 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia relating to cemetery associations by adding an additional paragraph thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 11101) to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request of the War Department), a bill (H. R. 11102) to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire the timber rights on Gigling Field Artillery Target Range in California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 11103) to promote the efficiency of the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 11104) to provide living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, for civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11105) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the memory of James B. Eads at New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A resolution (H. Res. 192) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives copies of documents relative to taxable years 1922 to 1928; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH: A resolution (H. Res. 193) extending congratulations to the Republic of Greece on the one hundredth anniversary of the independence of that nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 280) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Memorial of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey, protesting against deplorable condition in Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEGER: Memorial of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey, protesting against religious persecutions in Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: Memorial of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey, protesting against cruel, deliberate, and unrelenting suppression of the teaching and practice of all religion by the soviet government and the persecution of those who are devoted to their sacred traditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: Memorial of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey, protesting against soviet religious persecution in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 11106) granting an increase of pension to Louise Grasshoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 11107) to enroll John Benjamin King on the final roll of citizens of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians by blood; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 11108) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Goddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 11109) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Pockmier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11110) granting a pension to Rosa Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOLTON: A bill (H. R. 11111) granting a pension to Loisa Blasis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTGAU: A bill (H. R. 11112) for the relief of William R. Nolan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11113) for the relief of the widows and wife of certain Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. McCORMICK of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11114) granting a pension to Amanda H. Fairbank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 11115) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be made a preliminary examination and survey of Honga River and Tar Bay (Barren Island Gaps), in Maryland; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 11116) for the relief of Sidney Silverman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 11117) granting an increase of pension to Lottie T. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11118) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Denton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 11119) granting a pension to Blanche Gertrude Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 11120) granting an increase of pension to Ellen T. Pursell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11121) for the relief of the James River Bridge Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 11122) granting an increase of pension to Christina Stenger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11123) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stickell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 11124) granting a pension to Nancy J. Perrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11125) granting a pension to Henry Innis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11126) granting a pension to Matthew J. McKelvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11127) granting a pension to Amelia W. Ziegel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 11128) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 11129) granting an increase of pension to Elmina Crandall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 11130) authorizing the President to appoint Ronald E. Smith a second lieutenant, Infantry, in the United States Organized Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11131) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Zerner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11132) for the relief of Edward Knight; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 281) renewing and extending patent No. 601905 in favor of Walter L. Johnson and certain other persons; to the Committee on Patents.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6024. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of citizens of Washington, D. C., opposing the calling of an international conference by the President of the United States, or the acceptance by him of an invitation to participate in such a conference, for the purpose of revising the present calendar unless a proviso be attached thereto definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of the blank days; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6025. By Mr. BOLTON: Petition of citizens of Euclid, Ohio, urging favorable action on bills increasing Spanish War pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

6026. Also, petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging favorable action on legislation increasing the pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6027. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of city council of Burlington, Vt., relative to legislation granting pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

6028. Also, petition of the common council of the city of Rutland, Vt., relative to proclaiming October 11 of each year as

General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6029. By Mr. COLLIER: Memorial of the common council of the city of Vicksburg, State of Mississippi, memorializing Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 167 directing President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6030. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Independent Order Brith Abraham of Boston, Mass., protesting against registration of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6031. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of many citizens of California, favoring the passage of the Box bill restricting Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6032. Also, petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring more liberal pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6033. By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Petition of 71 citizens of Trenton, N. J., favoring increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6034. Also, resolution of Fairview Council, No. 248, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Mount Bethel, N. J., urging restriction of immigration to countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6035. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Butler Aerie, No. 407, Fraternal Order of Eagles, at Hamilton, Ohio, with a membership of 2,837, indorsing Senate bill 3257; to the Committee on Pensions.

6036. By Mr. GARBBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, opposing item on District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1931 providing for \$300,000 expenditure for farmers' wholesale produce market in southwest Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6037. Also, petition of governing board, conference of committees of the International Narcotic Education Association and the World Conference on Narcotic Education, urging cooperation in extension of narcotic surveys throughout the United States with a view to the establishment of a permanent national narcotic survey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6038. Also, petition of State Nurses' Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., urging the passage of House bill 1195; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6039. Also, petition of Department of Oklahoma Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, urging support of House bill 8765, introduced by Mr. STOBBS; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6040. Also, petition of Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, urging that Guthrie, Okla., be selected as location for institution to be established in connection with Senate bill 2557; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6041. Also, petition of three ex-United States deputy marshals, W. T. Taylor, A. J. Trail, and G. W. Cochran, of Claremore, Okla., urging favorable consideration of House bill 2968, introduced by Hon. CHARLES O'CONNOR of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6042. Also, petition of Associated Industries of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla., in opposition to old age pension law; to the Committee on Pensions.

6043. Also, petition of Hon. Henry S. Johnston, Perry, Okla., making protest against pending legislation which would outlaw the use of peyote by the Indians for ceremonial purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6044. Also, petition of State Board of Agriculture, Oklahoma City, Okla., urging heavy tariff on oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6045. Also, petition of Lamont City School, Lamont, Okla., indorsing House bill 10 urging the establishment of a national department of public education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on Education.

6046. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Earl Faulkner Post, No. 6, American Legion, of Everett, Wash., urging that legislation be enacted to amend the World War compensation act providing for the immediate payment of the full amount due as adjusted compensation to those entitled to same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6047. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of citizens of Calumet, Mich., asking favorable action on Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 for increase of pension to the men who served during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6048. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition signed by a number of citizens of Dixon, Ill., urging Congress to pass a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6049. By Mr. KOPP: Petition of Charles B. Gilworth and 70 other citizens of Fairfield, Iowa, urging increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6050. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., for increased pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6051. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Jeff Cunningham, of route 2, Prague, Okla., and other citizens of Lincoln County, Okla., urging immediate action on House bill 2562 providing increased rates of pension for veterans of the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6052. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of 20 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union assembled in session at Cartersville, Mo., March 11, 1930, urging the speedy enactment of certain radio legislation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6053. By Mr. PARKS: Petition of citizens of Arkadelphia, Clark County, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 11, known as the fair trade bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6054. By Mr. PRALL: Petition received from citizens of Staten Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the Capper-Robson bill; to the Committee on Education.

6055. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of citizens of Knox County, Mo., asking for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6056. By Mr. SANDLIN: Petition of some of the citizens of Shreveport, La., indorsing House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6057. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of mayor and City Council of Aliquippa, Beaver County, Pa., urging the enactment of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day, for the observation and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6058. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Fred E. Thompson, editor of the Doddridge County Republican, of West Union, W. Va., urging Congress to enact legislation that will check the influx of certain types of Mexican people, or at least place Mexican immigrants of this type on a par with immigrants from European countries; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6059. By Mr. WURZBACH: Petition of Ambrose E. McPherson and 24 other citizens of Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Tex., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6060. Also, petition of Parke Heaton, Maurice Kelly, W. M. Higgins, and 168 other citizens of San Antonio, Bexar County, Tex., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6061. Also, petition of C. L. Patterson and 15 other citizens of Wilson County, Tex., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6062. Also, petition of C. Jackson and 16 other citizens of Aransas Pass, San Patricio County, Tex., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6063. Also, petition of William P. Coulter and 35 other citizens urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 8976; to the Committee on Pensions.

6064. Also, petition of William H. Kelly and 408 other citizens of San Antonio, Bexar County, Tex., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 8976; to the Committee on Pensions.

6065. Also, petition of Robert E. Carlisle, B. McCluer, and 35 other citizens of San Antonio, Bexar County, Tex., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, March 26, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In the parting of the curtains of the night, Heavenly Father, and in the dawning of this day, Thou hast revealed Thyself anew. We seek Thy guidance. O give us this blessing. We do not pray for ease and rest but for powers equal to our tasks. Let not our failure dishearten us or any cause of delay chill us. We ask for Thy presence and for unutterable thoughts to rise within us. For life and love and for light, we thank Thee,

gracious Lord, and for all the great world with its infinitely many sources of truth and hope. Thou wilt never leave us, but will go with us all the way. May we scatter our flowers as we go, for we will never pass this way again. In the holy name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3657. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Custer County, Nebr.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6120. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630); the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes,' approved May 25, 1926," dated February 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 137); and the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as space for public buildings," approved January 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 51); and

H. R. 7491. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3189. An act for the relief of the State of South Carolina for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929;

S. 3487. An act to provide for the acceptance of a donation of land and the construction thereon of suitable buildings and appurtenances for the Forest Products Laboratory, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for a monument to Maj. Gen. William Crawford Gorgas, late Surgeon General of the United States Army; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend to foreign governments and individuals an invitation to join the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Va.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the list of committees.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees; and when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was reached—Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 8807.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

COORDINATION OF PUBLIC-HEALTH ACTIVITIES

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8807) to provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar. The House will go automatically into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union unless unanimous consent is given. Under the rule the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8807. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8807, with Mr. LUCE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8807, which the Clerk will report by title.

The title was again read.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I will not object. Do I understand that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] is going to make a speech on the bill?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.